TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

No. 294

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE FARMERS LOAN AND TRUST COMPANY, AS ADMINISTRATOR, ETC., PETITIONER,

vs.

GEORGE T. McGOWAN, COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE TWENTY-EIGHTH COLLECTION DISTRICT, NEW YORK

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR CERTIORARI FILED JULY 27, 1944.

CERTIORARI GRANTED OCTOBER 9, 1944.

INDEX

	PAGE
Statement Under Rule XIII	1
Complaint	2
Exhibit "A" Annexed to Complaint	13
Exhibit "B" Annexed to Complaint	18
Exhibit "C" Annexed to Complaint	26
Exhibit "D" Annexed to Complaint	34
Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Complaint	38
Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Complaint	39
Opinion of Judge John Knight on Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Complaint	40
Answer	42
Plaintiff's Notice to Admit Facts	43
Affidavit of Assistant U. S. Attorney Robert M. Hitchcock with Respect to Notice to Admit Facts	44
Testimony	46
Motion to Dismiss Complaint (Folio 193)	65
Motion for a Directed Verdict in Favor of the Government (Folio 193)	65
Motion for a Directed Verdict in Favor of the Government renewed (Folio 204)	68
Opinion	387
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	401
Stipulation as to Amount of Judgment	413
Judgment	416
Certificate of Probable Cause	418

PAGE

Notice of Appeal 419

Plaintiff's Appellant's Designation of the Portions of the Record, Proceedings and Evidence to Be Contained in the Record on Appeal 421

Stipulation Amending Designation of Record 427

Statement of Points 430

Stipulation as to Record 434

Clerk's Certificate 435

TESTIMONY.

Plaintiff's Witnesses:

Burrell T. Cappon,

Direct 47

EXHIBITS.

Plaintiff's Exhibits:

	Admitted Page	Printed Page
1—Appraiser's report, taxing order, receipt for the tax	49	69
2—Certificate of No Appeal	50	73
3—Letters of Administration	51	74
4—Short Form Certificate of Letters of Administration	51	
5—Inquisition	52	76
6—Order of August 12, 1926, appointing Committees	52	82
7—Commission to Committees, dated August 25, 1926	52	96

	Admitted Page	Printed Page
8—Commitment of Petition and Order	53	
9—Petition of M. H. Plumb	54	96
10—Answer and Cross Petition of Farmers Loan & Trust Co. in the 1926 proceedings	55	103
11—Notice of Appearance of Ieuan Harris as general guardian in the 1926 proceedings	55	

Proceedings in U. S. C. C. A., Second Circuit		436
Opinion, Hand, J.		436
Dissenting opinion, Swan, J.		442
Judgment		444
Clerk's certificate	(omitted in printing)	445
Order allowing certiorari		445

17—Petition of M. H. Plumb, with notice of motion	58	175
18—Notice of Appearance of City Bank Farmers Trust Co.	58	
19—Answer of Committee of the Property	58	181
20—Notice of Appearance of Ieuan Harris as general guardian	58	
21—Answer of Ieuan Harris as general guardian	58	185
22—Affidavit of Dr. Neumann of May 3, 1932	59	
23—Order of May 4, 1932, appointing special guardian and referee	59	187

	Admitted Page	Printed Page
24—Answer of Special Guardian for Incompetent	59	
25—Notice of Hearing before the Referee	59	
26—Testimony before the Referee	59	191
27—Notice of presentation of Referee's report	59	
28—Report of Referee	60	271
29—Order of May 31, 1932, amending title and prayer of petition	60	283
30—Order of June 3, 1932, granting allowances	60	285
31—Report of Special Guardian	60	294
32—Intermediate account of the City Bank Farmers Trust Co. as Committee of the Incompetent Helen Hall Vail	61	309
33—Supplemental Account	61	324
34—Report of Special Guardian for the Incompetent	62	
35—Judgment of February 20, 1934	62	329
36—Final Account	63	338
37—Final Order of December 9, 1936, settling Final Account	63	349
38—Federal Estate Tax return on Form 706	63	357
39—Claim for Refund	63	364
40—Letter from Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated November 3, 1937	63	376
41—Letter from Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated April 5, 1938	64	381

	Admitted Page	Printed Page
42—Notice and demand for payment of $436,031.67 and interest of $30,880.60...	64	
43—Letter from Treasury Department, dated July 28, 1938, rejecting claim for refund	64	385
Defendant's Exhibits:		
A—Income tax return for year 1927 of Mr. Harris'	66	
B—Income tax return for year 1928 of Mr. Harris	66	
C—Income tax return for year 1929 of Mr. Harris	66	
D—Income tax return for year 1930 of Mr. Harris	67	

United States Circuit Court of Appeals

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

1

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, formerly known as THE FARMERS LOAN AND TRUST COMPANY, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of HELEN HALL VAIL, Deceased,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

against

GEORGE T. McGOWAN, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-eighth Collection District, New York,

Defendant-Appellee.

2

Statement Under Rule XIII

This action was commenced by the service of a summons and complaint upon the defendant-appellee on or about March 6, 1939. The names of the original parties to this action are stated in the title hereof and no additional or other parties have become parties before this appeal and there has been no change in any of the parties.

The complaint was filed on or about March 6, 1939; the answer was filed on or about January 19, 1940.

There was no arrest, bail or attachment and no proceedings thereunder.

3

Trial of the action was had without a jury on May 6th and 7th, 1941, before the Hon. John Knight, one of the judges of the United States District Court for the Western District of New York.

No question was referred to a commissioner or commissioners; master or referee.

The final judgment was made and entered in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of New York on May 14, 1943.

This appeal was taken from said judgment by the filing of a notice of appeal on August 9, 1943, and by the filing of the necessary bond for costs, pursuant to Rule 73 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

4

Complaint.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Complaint at Law

No. Civ. 131

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, formerly known as THE FARMERS LOAN AND TRUST COMPANY, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of HELEN HALL VAIL, Deceased,

5 Plaintiff,

against

GEORGE T. McGOWAN, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-eighth Collection District, New York,

Defendant.

The plaintiff above named, appearing herein by its attorneys, Montgomery, Peabody, Grace & Derby, for its complaint, respectfully shows upon information and belief:

6 1. That the plaintiff, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, formerly known as The Farmers Loan and Trust Company, is a domestic corporation, having its principal place of business at No. 22 William Street, Borough of Manhattan, City of New York. On the 29th day of June, 1929, by certificate duly filed in the Office of the Secretary of State of the State of New York, the plaintiff's name was changed from The Farmers Loan and Trust Company to City Bank Farmers Trust Company.

2. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, from and after August 25, 1933, the defendant, George T. McGowan,

was and still is the Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-Eighth United States Collection District, New York, and resides therein.

3. That on February 10, 1936, Letters of Administration of all the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, were duly granted and issued to the plaintiff by the Surrogate's Court of the County of Ontario, State of New York, and plaintiff duly qualified as such Administrator and at all times since has acted and is now acting as such.

4. That previous to her death and on or about the 12th day of August, 1926, the said Helen Hall Vail, pursuant to proceedings in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, a court of competent jurisdiction, was duly adjudged to be an incompetent person, incapable of managing herself and her affairs, and thereafter on or about the 25th day of August, 1926, the plaintiff, then known as The Farmers Loan and Trust Company, was duly appointed by a commission, issued out of the said Court, Committee of the Property and Estate of the said Helen Hall Vail; that the plaintiff thereafter duly qualified and acted as such Committee of the Property and Estate of the said Helen Hall Vail until the 27th day of December, 1935, when the said Helen Hall Vail died intestate.

5. That following the appointment of City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the Property and Estate of said Helen Hall Vail, her daughter MaBelle H. Plumb petitioned the Supreme Court of the State of New York for allowances to herself and others out of the surplus income of the said incompetent person and pursuant to proceedings duly had, wherein it was found that the incompetent when sane was accustomed to make gifts to her children and relatives, for purposes associated with life, and

that such allowances would have been made by her had she been in possession of her faculties, an order was therein duly made by said court on the 14th day of January, 1927, whereby the said Committee of the Property and Estate of Helen Hall Vail was directed, among other things, to pay out of the surplus income of said incompetent person each year in equal quarterly payments, the following sums to the following named persons:

To MaBelle Houghton Plumb, a daughter of said
11 incompetent person, the sum of Fifty Thousand ($50,000) Dollars.

To Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, minor grandchildren of said incompetent person, the sum of Fifty Thousand ($50,000) Dollars.

To Edward Hegeman Hall, a brother of said incompetent person, the sum of Two Thousand ($2,000) Dollars.

To Mary Hall Taft, a sister of said incompetent person, the sum of Three Thousand ($3,000) Dollars.

12 To Elizabeth Hall Burdick, a sister of said incompetent person, the sum of Two Thousand ($2,000) Dollars.

To Abbe Ferrin, a sister of said incompetent person, the sum of Two Thousand ($2,000) Dollars.

To Lucy Hall Ferris, a sister of said incompetent person, the sum of Two Thousand ($2,000) Dollars.

A copy of said order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, dated January 14, 1927, is annexed hereto and made a part hereof and marked Exhibit "A".

6. That thereafter, by her petition verified the 26th day of April, 1932, the said MaBelle H. Plumb petitioned the Supreme Court of the State of New York for an increase in the amount of the allowances theretofore made to herself and Ieuan Harris, as general guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, the minor grandchildren above named of the said Helen Hall Vail, and pursuant to proceedings duly had upon said petition, wherein the court found that such increases would have been made by the said Helen Hall Vail if in possession of her faculties, an order was therein duly made by said court on the 3rd day of June, 1932, whereby the said Committee of the property of said Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, was directed to pay out of the income of said incompetent person received by it in each quarter, in addition to the amounts paid by said Committee of the property under said order dated January 14, 1927, provided that there should be sufficient surplus income at the end of each quarter so to do, after deducting all other payments for that quarter, the following sums to the following named persons:

> To said MaBelle Houghton Plumb the sum of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty ($6,250) Dollars.
>
> To said Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian as aforesaid, the sum of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty ($6,250) Dollars.

7. That said order of June 3, 1932, by its terms was made retroactive and further directed the said Committee of the Property to pay out of the accumulated surplus income of said incompetent person then in its possession, to said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and said Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian as aforesaid, the sum of One Hundred Thirty-one Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty ($131,250) Dollars each, as and for a payment of $25,000 per annum for the

16 *Complaint.*

five calendar years last past and of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty ($6,250) Dollars as and for the quarterly installment due March 31, 1932, of the additional allowances granted by said order of June 3, 1932. A copy of said order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, dated June 3, 1932, is annexed hereto and made a part hereof and marked Exhibit "B".

8. That pursuant to said two orders of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, respectively dated January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932, and from January 14, 1927, the
17 date of the first of said orders, to December 27, 1935, the date of death of said Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, plaintiff, as Committee of the Property of said Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, paid out of her surplus income to the persons therein named, allowances aggregating the sum of One Million Three Hundred Seventy-seven Thousand Eight Hundred Sixty-six and 67/100 Dollars ($1,377,866.67), a schedule of which is hereto annexed, marked Exhibit "C".

9. That on or about the 9th day of May, 1933, upon the application of City Bank Farmers Trust Company (for-
18 merly The Farmers Loan and Trust Company), permission was granted to it by an order duly made by the Supreme Court of the State of New York in New York County to account as Committee of the Property and Estate of said Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, and in conformity therewith, the plaintiff as such Committee duly filed an account of its proceedings for the period from August 12, 1926 to July 1, 1933, which embraced and reflected all payments made during said period by said Committee of the Property pursuant to said orders granting allowances of January 14, 1927 and of June 3, 1932; that a special guardian was appointed by the court to protect the rights and

19

interest of the Incompetent, and pursuant to proceedings duly had, a judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, dated the 19th day of February, 1934, was duly made and entered wherein and whereby it was, among other things, ordered, adjudged and decreed that the payments made by the Committee of the Property of the said incompetent person, as set forth in its accounts, be approved, ratified and confirmed.

10. That the said Helen Hall Vail died on or about the 27th day of December, 1935 and thereafter, upon application of City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee 20
of her property and estate, permission was granted by an order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, duly made and dated the 30th day of June, 1936, to said Committee to make and render its final account as Committee of the Property of the deceased incompetent person; that in conformity therewith the Committee filed an account of its proceedings for the period from July 1, 1933 to December 27, 1935, the date of death of said Helen Hall Vail, which said account embraced and reflected all payments made by the Committee of the Property during said period, pursuant to said two orders granting allowances; that the order granting permission to the Committee to account 21
directed that notice of the filing of the account be given to all persons interested in the deceased incompetent person's estate and notice having been duly given in conformity with the directions of said order, such proceedings were thereupon duly had that thereafter and on or about the 9th day of December, 1936, a final judgment was therein duly made and entered by said court, wherein and whereby it was, among other things, ordered, adjudged and decreed that the payments made by the Committee of the Property of the said deceased incompetent, as set forth in said account, be approved, ratified and confirmed.

22 *Complaint.*

11. That on or about January 27, 1937, plaintiff, as administrator of all the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, caused to be filed in the Office of the defendant at Buffalo, New York, pursuant to the Revenue Act of 1926 and the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended, an Estate Tax Return on Form 706. In Schedule E of said return, plaintiff, as such administrator, set forth the aggregate amount of the allowances paid pursuant to the said orders of January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932, to wit: the sum of $1,377,866.67, for information purposes only, and
23 filed with said Estate Tax Return copies of said two orders but plaintiff did not include the said amount in computing the Estate Tax payable and plaintiff did not then, nor does it now, admit that said allowances or any part thereof constituted transfers made by the decedent during her life, to be included in decedent's gross estate either under any provision of any Revenue Act, or otherwise.

12. That thereafter, plaintiff as such administrator was advised by Treasury Department letter dated April 5, 1938, a copy of which is annexed and marked Exhibit "D", of a deficiency in Federal Estate Tax liability, as computed in the Return made by the plaintiff, and of the Government's
24 claim to an additional tax, upon the ground that the aggregate amount of the allowances paid as aforesaid were properly includible in the decedent's gross estate under the provisions of Section 302-c of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended.

13. That plaintiff protested against the additional tax proposed but its protest was overruled and thereafter, in the month of June, 1938, the defendant, the said George T. McGowan, acting as Collector of Internal Revenue for the said Twenty-eighth Collection District of New York, demanded of plaintiff as such administrator the sum of Four Hundred Thirty-six Thousand Thirty-one and 67/100 Dollars ($436,031.67) as and for a deficiency in the amount of

taxes payable and paid by plaintiff as administrator, on account of its Federal Estate Tax liability, together with interest in the amount of Thirty Thousand Eight Hundred Eighty and 60/100 Dollars ($30,880.60), which sums defendant as such Collector claimed to be then due and payable from plaintiff as such administrator, under and pursuant to the provisions of Section 302-c of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended.

14. That plaintiff, solely in order to avoid the imposition of penalties and interest and the distraint and sale of the property in its custody as such administrator, and under compulsion, duress and coercion, paid to the defendant, as such Collector, on or about the 22nd day of June, 1938, the said sum of Four Hundred Thirty-six Thousand Thirty-one and 67/100 Dollars, together with the said sum of interest amounting to Thirty Thousand Eight Hundred Eighty and 60/100 Dollars (30,880.60), and plaintiff, as such administrator, at the time of said payments, protested in writing to the defendant that no deficiency existed in the amount of the sums payable and paid by it on account of its Federal Estate Tax liability and that the assessment of said tax and the said tax, together with the interest thereon, were erroneous and illegal and that payment thereof was made solely to prevent the imposition of penalties threatened and the attachment of property.

15. That thereafter, and on or about July 8, 1938, plaintiff, as such administrator, duly appealed to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by filing with the defendant a claim for the refund of the alleged deficiency in Federal Estate Tax and interest thereon, paid as alleged in the preceding paragraph, upon the ground that the payments made as aforesaid pursuant to said court orders were not transfers in contemplation of death and were not and are not within the purview and scope and meaning of Section 302-c

28 *Complaint.*

of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended; and upon the further ground that, inasmuch as testamentary motive, which is essential to a gift in contemplation of death, cannot by any provision of positive law be attributed to a person who has been adjudged to be incompetent, a tax based upon a presumption so arbitrary and opposed to fact illegally deprived the distributees of this estate of their property without due process of law guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States and its amendments.

16. That said claim for refund was thereafter and on or
29 about July 28, 1938, wholly rejected and denied in writing by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, upon the ground that the said transfers were made in contemplation of the decedent's death and the value of the property transferred had been properly included in the decedent's gross estate under the provisions of Section 302-c of the Revenue Act of 1926.

17. That the orders of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, pursuant to which the said transfers were made, did not purport to execute and did not execute, on behalf of the said Helen Hall Vail, any gift in contemplation of her death or transfer in the nature thereof; that
30 the transfers aforesaid were not within the scope and purview of Section 302 (c) of the Act of Congress, known as the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, as said Act was, upon its enactment, intended to be construed and interpreted; that the construction and interpretation by the Commissioner of Section 302 (c) of the said Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, as applicable to the transfers aforesaid, was erroneous and illegal, in that such construction and interpretation attributed testamentary motive to the said Helen Hall Vail, who had been judicially declared an incompetent person, and to the aforesaid orders of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, made on her behalf.

31

18. That the said Helen Hall Vail was incapable of possessing or exercising any intent whatsoever. That Section 302 (c) of Title 3 of the Act of Congress known as the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, is unconstitutional and void in so far as the same may be asserted to confer power to make said assessment against plaintiff and compel payment thereof for the reason that testamentary motive essential to a gift in contemplation of death cannot be attributed validly by legislative act to persons who have been adjudged incompetent to manage themselves and their affairs; that, so construed, it is arbitrary, capricious, confiscatory, discriminatory and admits of assumptions which are contrary to fact, and by said Act and by the assessment and collection by the defendant of the tax paid thereon as hereinbefore alleged, the plaintiff, as Administrator of the Estate of the said Helen Hall Vail, and the distributees of her estate, have been denied the equal protection of the laws and wrongfully and illegally deprived of their property in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the Fifth Amendment thereof, which provides that no person shall be deprived of property without due process of law.

32

19. That the orders granting the allowances out of said Helen Hall Vail's income were made pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction over the property and affairs of incompetents of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, which is a branch of the Government of the State of New York. The said court, through its agent, the Committee of said incompetent's property, had custody of the incompetent's funds and it made the said transfers from its said custody to the recipients. The tax imposed and collected by the defendant herein was levied, not upon the property so transferred, but upon the transfer itself, made by the court. Section 302 (c) of Title 3 of the Act of Congress known as the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, is unconstitutional and void in so far as the same may be asserted to confer power to make said assessment and compel the

33

34 *Complaint.*

payment of said tax for the reason that, so construed, it constitutes an illegal interference by the United States with a necessary, proper, important and inherent function of the sovereign State of New York, in violation of the Tenth Amendment and other provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

20. That this is an action at law and the matters in controversy in this action and the cause of action hereinabove set forth arise under the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States providing for internal
35 revenue.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff, as administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, avers that defendant has erroneously and illegally demanded and collected estate taxes from the plaintiff, based upon the unlawful and illegal inclusion in the gross estate of the said decedent of the value of said transfers made pursuant to orders of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, as hereinabove alleged, and plaintiff demands judgment against the defendant for the sum of Four Hundred Sixty-six Thousand Nine Hundred Twelve and 27/100 Dollars ($466,912.27), with interest thereon from the 22nd day of
36 June, 1938, together with the costs and disbursements of this action.

MONTGOMERY, PEABODY, GRACE & DERBY,
By JAMES LLOYD DERBY,
J. SEYMOUR MONTGOMERY, JR.,
Members of the firm
Attorneys for Plaintiff,
Office and P. O. Address,
One Cedar Street,
Borough of Manhattan,
City of New York, N. Y.

(Verified by P. A. Miller, a trust officer of plaintiff.)

Exhibit "A" Annexed to Complaint.

37

At a Special Term, Part II, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, held in and for the County of New York, at the County Court House, in the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 14th day of January, 1927.

Present: Honorable Richard P. Lydon, Justice.

In the Matter

38

of

the application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for an allowance to be paid herself and others from the income accruing each year to Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person.

On reading and filing the petition herein of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, applying for an allowance each year out of the income of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent person, for herself and others, and the cross-petition of The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent, asking for the instruction of this Court as to relief prayed for in said petition, and upon the Order of Reference herein, entered in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the 26th day of November, 1926, wherein and whereby the matter was referred to Philip J. Dunn, Esquire, of the City of New York, as sole referee, to take proof of the facts alleged in the petition and to report to the Court, with all convenient speed upon the matters referred to him by the order, with his opinion, and the

39

said petitioner MaBelle Houghton Plumb, by Messrs. Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, her attorneys, having duly moved for the confirmation of the said Referee's Report, and the other parties hereto having duly waived further notice of said motion, and said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee as aforesaid, having duly appeared upon such motion by Messrs. Geller, Rolston & Blanc, its attorneys, and having submitted the interests of the incompetent to the protection of the Court, and Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of
41 John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, having duly apeared upon said motion by Messrs. Dean, King & Smith their attorneys, and having submitted the interests of his wards to the protection of the Court, and due deliberation having been had thereon, and

ON READING and FILING the affidavit of Philip J. Dunn, Esquire, the Referee, the affidavit of John S. Montgomery, Esquire, a member of the firm of Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, the attorneys for the petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the affidavit of Frederic P. King, Esquire, a member of the firm of Dean, King & Smith, the attorneys for Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H. Harris,
42 William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, and the affidavit of Charles Angulo, Esquire, a member of the firm of Geller, Rolston & Blanc, the attorneys for the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent, with respect to the services rendered by each of them in this proceeding, and

ON READING and FILING the testimony taken at said hearing and the report of the said Referee, and it appearing to my satisfaction that the income of the said incompetent for the last four or five years has averaged over Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, and that to maintain

Exhibit "A", Annexed to Complaint.

and support the incompetent, and to care for her property, there cannot reasonably be expended a greater sum than Fifty Thousand Dollars, and that the said Helen Hall Vail has not made a last will and testament and that the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the only surviving child of said incompetent, or her issue, and the said John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, the three children of a deceased daughter of said incompetent, or their issue, will be, upon the death of said incompetent, the only heirs-at-law and next-of-kin of said incompetent, and the only persons entitled to share in her estate, and this Court having found and hereby finding, upon the evidence submitted before said Referee and to this Court, that if the said incompetent Helen Hall Vail were in the possession of her mental faculties and in all respects competent, she would desire that the allowance hereinafter fixed be made to the persons hereinafter designated, and would make such allowance to such persons out of her property.

NOW ON MOTION of MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE, attorneys for said petitioner, and no one appearing in opposition thereto, it is

ORDERED that the report of said Referee be and the same is hereby in all respects confirmed, it is

FURTHER ORDERED that The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent person, pay out of the income of the said incompetent, each year in equal quarterly payments the following sums to the following named persons

To MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB, the petitioner, the daughter of said incompetent, the sum of Fifty Thousand ($50,000.) Dollars,

46 *Exhibit "A", Annexed to Complaint.*

To Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of Fifty Thousand ($50,000.) Dollars,

To Edward Hageman Hall, the brother of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars,

To Mary Hall Taft, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Three Thousand Dollars,

47 To Elizabeth Hall Burdick, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars,

To Abbe Ferrin, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars,

To Lucy Hall Ferris, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars, and it is

Further ordered that the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the Property of the incompetent, pay out of the income in its hands the fol-
48 lowing sums

To Philip J. Dunn, Esquire, the Referee, the sum of Three Thousand and Five Hundred Dollars, as and for the allowance to which he is entitled, for his services herein

To Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, as attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, the sum of Five Thousand Dollars, as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein, together with the sum of Two hundred and seventy-eight 90/100—to cover their disbursements herein

Exhibit "A", Annexed to Complaint.

49

To Dean, King & Smith, as attorneys for Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of One Thousand and Five Hundred Dollars, as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein

To Geller, Rolston & Blanc, as attorneys for The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail the incompetent, the sum of One Thousand Dollars, as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein, and it is

50

Further ordered that if upon the death of Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent, it shall appear that the total allowances received by MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and the total aggregate allowances received by the said three grandchildren, John H. Harris, William R. Harris, and David F. Harris, or their guardian, Ieuan Harris, for their account, shall not be equal to each other, that the excess received by either MaBelle Houghton Plumb, or the said three grandchildren, or their guardian, shall be considered as an advancement, and it is

51

Further ordered that the application of the said Committee for instructions be and the same is hereby granted and that said Committee be and is hereby instructed to make the payments hereinbefore specified as the Committee of the said incompetent's property.

Enter

R. P. L.
J. S. C.

52 **Exhibit "B" Annexed to Complaint.**

At a Special Term, Part 1 of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, held in and for the County of New York, at the County Court House, in the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 3rd day of June, 1932.

Present: Honorable PHOENIX INGRAHAM, Justice

53 IN THE MATTER

of the

Application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for an additional allowance to be paid to herself and others from the income received by the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an incompetent person.

54 ON READING AND FILING the amended petition of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB praying for an additional yearly allowance of $25,000.00 for herself and for Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants and further praying that said allowance be made retroactive for five years and that said additional allowances for the past five years amounting to $25,000 each year be paid out of the accumulated surplus income in the possession of the said Committee, $125,000.00 to the petitioner and $125,000.00 to said Ieuan Harris as such Guardian, and

Exhibit "B", Annexed to Complaint.

55

ON READING the answer of Cornelius J. Smyth, the Special Guardian duly appointed by this Court by an Order dated the 4th day of May, 1932, to protect the interests of the said incompetent, which said Order dispensed with service of all papers in this proceeding upon the incompetent, the answer of the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of the incompetent Helen Hall Vail, by Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, its attorneys, and the Answer of Ienan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants by Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, his attorneys, and an Order having been duly entered in this Court on the 4th day of May, 1932, appointing Townsend Morgan, Esquire, Referee to hear and take testimony of the respective parties and to report to his Court with his opinion with all convenient speed, and

56

ON READING the report of the said Referee dated the 25th day of May, 1932, heretofore duly filed herein, wherein he recommends that allowances be granted as prayed for, and

ON READING the report of the Special Guardian heretofore duly filed herein, and

57

ON READING the testimony taken at said Hearing from which it appears that there is accumulated income in the possession of the Committee of an inventoried value of $1,051,078.56, and whereas from the said testimony it appears that the income for the past five and one-half years has averaged about $395,000.00 a year, and the surplus income after paying all expenses, including allowances heretofore granted by the Order of January 14th, 1927, and paying all expenses, and etc. on account of the incompetent for her care and maintenance averaged about $191,105.18 a

58 *Exhibit "B", Annexed to Complaint.*

year, and it further appearing that said Helen Hall Vail is seventy-seven years of age and will not recover from the disease from which she is suffering and that her only issue is the petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb and her son, Joseph H. Plumb, Jr., and the three infants, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, children of a deceased daughter of the incompetent, and that said Helen Hall Vail has not made her Last Will and Testament, and that upon the death of the said incompetent the only persons entitled to share in her estate will be the said
59 MaBelle Houghton Plumb the only surviving child of said incompetent and her son, Joseph H. Plumb, Jr., and the said John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris the three children of a deceased daughter of said incompetent, or their issue, and this Court having found upon the evidence submitted before the said Referee and to this Court, that if the said incompetent, Helen Hall Vail, were in possession of her mental faculties and in all respects competent, she would desire that the allowance hereinafter fixed be made to the persons hereinafter designated, and would make such allowances to such persons out of her property, and

60

ON READING the affidavit of John S. Montgomery, Esquire, a member of the firm of Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, the attorneys for the petitioner, and the affidavit of Cornelius J. Smyth, Esquire, Special Guardian of the incompetent, the affidavit of Townsend Morgan, Esquire, Referee, the affidavit of Frederick P. King, Esquire, a member of the firm of Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, the attorneys for Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants and the affidavits of Charles Angulo, Esquire, a member of the firm of Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, attorneys for the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee

61

of the property of the incompetent, with respect to the services rendered by each of them in this proceeding, and no objection having been made except by the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the Property, and

ON READING AND FILING proof of service of the Notice of Settlement of this Order upon all the parties who have appeared herein,

NOW ON MOTION OF MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE, attorneys for said petitioner, it is

62

ORDERED that the CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person pay out of the income received by it in each quarter, on the last day of the quarter, to wit: the last days of March, June, September and December in each year, in addition to the amounts paid by it under the Order of this Court dated the 14th day of January, 1927, provided that there be sufficient surplus income at the end of each quarter so to do, after deducting all other payments for that quarter, the following sums to the following named persons—

63

TO MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB, the petitioner, the daughter of said incompetent, the sum of SIX THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY ($6,250) DOLLARS;

TO IRVAN HARRIS, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of SIX THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY ($6,250.00) DOLLARS; and it is further

ORDERED that out of the surplus income now in its possession that the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as

64 *Exhibit "B", Annexed to Complaint.*

Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent person pay

To MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, the sum of One Hundred and Thirty-One Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($131,250.00) representing a payment of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars ($25,000) per annum, for the past five years, and of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250), being the quarterly installment due March 31st, 1932, of additional allowances
65 as above ordered, and

To Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of One Hundred and Thirty-One Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($131,250.00), representing a payment of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars ($25,000) per annum for the past five years, and of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250) being the quarterly installment due March 31st, 1932, of additional allowances as above ordered, and it is further

66 Ordered that the said City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, pay out of the income in its possession the following sums—

To Townsend Morgan, Esquire, the Referee, the sum of Five Thousand Dollars, as and for the allowance to which he is entitled, for his services herein;

To Cornelius J. Smyth, Esquire, the Special Guardian of the incompetent person, the sum of Sixty Five Hundred Dollars, as and for the allowance to which he is entitled, for his services herein;

Exhibit "B", Annexed to Complaint.

67

To Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, as attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, the sum of Sixty Five Hundred Dollars, as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein, together with the sum of Two Hundred Dollars, to cover their disbursements herein;

To Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, as attorneys for Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of Twenty Five Hundred Dollars, as and for allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein; 68

To Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, as attorneys for The City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail the incompetent, the sum of Twenty Five Hundred Dollars, as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein, and it is further

Ordered that if upon the death of Helen Hall Vail the incompetent, it shall appear that the total allowances received by MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and the total aggregate allowances received by the said three grandchildren, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, or their guardian, Ieuan Harris for their account, shall not be equal to each other, that the excess received by either MaBelle Houghton Plumb, or the said three grandchildren, or their guardian, shall be considered as an advancement, and it is further 69

Ordered that for the purpose of raising sufficient cash with which to make the payments hereinbefore directed to be made at this time, said City Bank Farmers Trust

70 *Exhibit "B", Annexed to Complaint.*

Company as Committee of the property as aforesaid, sell forthwith the following securities, at the prices set opposite the same below, or better, and that it expend the net proceeds thereof in making said payment after having applied thereto any cash income now in its hands available for that purpose.

List of property to be sold by the Committee of the property of the Incompetent at the prices listed opposite the same or better.

71 $30,000. par value City of Cleveland, Ohio, Water Works 4½s due 12/1/36 @ 93

10,000. par value City of Kansas City, Missouri, Missouri River Bridge Gold Bonds, Series 21, 4¼s due 4/1/49 @ 92

20,000. par value registered City of Minneapolis permanent improvement 4s, due 9/1/46 @ 90

10,000. par value City of Mt. Vernon North Fourth Avenue widening 3¾s due 10/1/42 @ 81

30,000. par value City of Mt. Vernon North Fourth
72 Avenue widening 3¾s due 10/1/43 @ 81

5,000. par value City of New Rochelle, New York, Municipal Improvement Bonds, Series of 1929 4¼s due 5/1/37 @ 91

5,000. par value of City of New Rochelle, New York, School Board, Series of 1929, 4¼s due 5/1/37 @ 91

12,000. City of New York Corp. Stock to provide for supply of water 4¼s due 3/1/64 @ 75

51,000. City of New York Corp. stock for construction of rapid transit railway 4¼s due 3/1/81 @ 75

Exhibit "B", Annexed to Complaint.

73

18,000. City of Trenton, New Jersey, Series A 363 General Improvement Funding Bonds of 1929 4¼s due 2/1/39 @ 90

35,000. State of New Jersey State Highway Bd. Act. of 1927 Series A 4¼s due 7/1/44 @ 95

12,000. par value State of West Virginia Roads Series A 1931, 3½s due 6/1/50 @ 82

30,000. State of West Virginia Roads, Series A, 1931 3½s due 6/1/54 @ 82

74

And if the net proceeds of the foregoing should prove insufficient, then also, in so far as required to make up the deficiency the following—

$25,000. Cuyohoga County, Ohio, Jail and Court House Buildings, 4¼s due 4/1/45 @ 84

10,000. City of Newark, New Jersey, Port Newark Improvement 4¼s due 8/1/43 @ 86

1,000. City of Newark Market House, 4½s due 12/1/48 @ 84

16,000. County of Hudson, New Jersey Park Bonds 4s due 11/1/54 @ 72 75

4,000. County of Hudson, New Jersey Park Bonds 4s due 5/1/54 @ 72

Enter,

P. I.
J. S. C.

76

Exhibit "C" Annexed to Complaint.

SCHEDULE OF ALLOWANCES PAID OUT OF THE SURPLUS INCOME OF HELEN HALL VAIL, AN INCOMPETENT PERSON, PURSUANT TO THE ORDERS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, DATED JANUARY 14, 1927, AND JUNE 3, 1932, RESPECTIVELY

1927		
Mar. 31	Mary Hall Taft	$ 750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00
	Abbe Ferrin	500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
77	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
July 2	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00
	Abbe Ferrin	500.00
78 Sept. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
Oct. 21	New Rochelle Trust Co., Executor estate Abbe Hall Ferrin, being amount of quarterly payment accrued to Sept. 6, 1927, date of death	366.67

Exhibit "C", Annexed to Complaint. 79

1928		
Jan. 3	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
Mar. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
June 29	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
Sept. 29	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
Dec. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00

80

81

82 *Exhibit "C", Annexed to Complaint.*

1929			
Mar. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick		500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
June 29	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian		
83	of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick		500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
Sept. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick		500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
84 Dec. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick		500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
1930			
Mar. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00

Exhibit "C", Annexed to Complaint.

1930			85
Mar. 30	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
June 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00	
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	86
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
Sept. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00	
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
Dec. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00	
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	87
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
1931			
Mar. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00	
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	

88 *Exhibit "C", Annexed to Complaint.*

1931			
June 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick		500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
Sept. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		12,500.00
89	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick		500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
Dec. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick		500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
90 1932			
Mar. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		12,500.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
Apr. 2	Elizabeth Hall Burdick		500.00
June 21	MaBelle Houghton Plumb pursuant to order of Supreme Court, New York County, dated June 3, 1932		131,250.00

Exhibit "C", Annexed to Complaint.

91

1931			
22	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris a/c of $131,250. due pursuant to order of Supreme Court, New York County, dated June 3, 1932		95,000.00
30	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
July 1	MaBelle Houghton Plumb, a/c of $12,500. due June 30, 1932, pursuant to order of Supreme Court, New York County, dated January 14, 1927		8,385.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, a/c of $12,500. due June 30, 1932 pursuant to order of Supreme Court		8,385.00
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, pursuant to order of Supreme Court, New York County, dated June 3, 1932, balance of $131,250		36,250.00
28	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, balance due on payment of June 30, 1932	$4,113.00	
	Additional allowance per Court Order dated June 3, 1932	6,250.00	10,365.00
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb, balance due on payment of June 30, 1932	4,115.00	
	Additional allowance per Court Order dated June 3, 1932	6,250.00	10,365.00

92

93

94 *Exhibit "C", Annexed to Complaint.*

1932			
Sept. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		18,750.00
30	Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		18,750.00
30	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
Dec. 31	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		18,750.00
95	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		18,750.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
1933			
Mar. 31	Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		18,750.00
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		18,750.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00
96 July 1	MaBelle Houghton Plumb		18,750.00
	Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris		18,750.00
Oct. 2	As of September 30, 1933, paid MaBelle Houghton Plumb		18,750.00
	As of September 30, 1933, paid Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris		18,750.00
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00

Exhibit "C", Annexed to Complaint.

97

1933			
Dec. 30	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00	
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	18,750.00	
1934			
Mar. 31	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
	Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris, per decree of Supreme Court 1/14/27	18,750.00	98
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	18,750.00	
June 30	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00	
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	18,750.00	
Sept. 29	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00	
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	18,750.00	99
Dec. 31	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	18,750.00	
	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00	
1935			
Mar. 30	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	18,750.00	
	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00	

100 *Exhibit "D", Annexed to Complaint.*

1935		
June 29	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	18,750.00
	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
Sept. 30	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	18,750.00
101	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
		$1,377,866.67

Exhibit "D" Annexed to Complaint.

80M Rev. June, 1934

Apr 5 1938

MT—ET—CI—4169—28th New York
Estate of Helen Hall Vail
Date of death—December 27, 1935

102 City Bank Farmers Trust Company, Administrator,
22 William Street,
New York, New York.

Sirs:

A deficiency of $645,654.48 in the Federal estate tax liability of the above-named estate has been determined after a review of the file in the case and a consideration of the protest against a deficiency proposed in a previous letter from this office. The determination of the deficiency and the action of this office on the protest are fully explained in the attached statement.

This notice of deficiency is given in accordance with the provisions of Section 308 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1926

Exhibit "D"; Annexed to Complaint.

as amended by Section 501 of the Revenue Act of 1934, and a petition for a redetermination of the deficiency may be filed with the United States Board of Tax Appeals within 90 days (not counting Sunday or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the ninetieth day) from the date of the mailing of this letter. If you acquiesce in this determination and do not desire to file a petition with the United States Board of Tax Appeals, you are requested to execute and forward the enclosed Form 890, waiving the restrictions on the immediate assessment and collection of the deficiency.

The submission of the waiver will expedite the closing of this case and will also benefit the estate by preventing the accumulation of interest charges, as the interest period terminates 30 days after the filing of the waiver or on the date of assessment, whichever is earlier. The signing of the waiver does not prejudice your right to file a claim for refund of all or any portion of the tax. If you desire to consent to the assessment and collection of only a part of the deficiency, the enclosed form of waiver should be executed in such partial amount.

If within the 90-day period a petition has not been filed with the United States Board of Tax Appeals or the waiver, Form 890, has not been submitted, the deficiency will be thereafter assessed.

Respectfully,

GUY T. HELVERING,
Commissioner.

By (Signed) D. S. BLISS
D. S. Bliss,
Deputy Commissioner.

Enclosures:
Statement,
Waiver, Form 890.

JFM:SKB

106 *Exhibit "D", Annexed to Complaint.*

MT—ET—4169—28th New York
Estate of Helen Hall Vail
Date of death—December 27, 1935

STATEMENT

The protest relates to the following items:

GROSS ESTATE

107

Transfers	*Returned*	*Tentatively Determined*	*Determined*
Payments made from the decedent's estate pursuant to the orders of the Supreme Court of New York, dated January 14, 1927, and June 3, 1932	$ 0.00	$1,377,866.67	$1,377,866.67

After a careful review of all of the evidence of record it is held that the above transfers were properly included
108 in the decedent's gross estate under the provisions of section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended.

DEDUCTIONS

Debts of decedent:

Item 2	23,153.39	23,153.39	31,038.30
Item 3	30,000.00	30,000.00	40,653.[illegible]

The above items under debts of decedent have been increased to cover the additional amounts paid subsequent to the filing of the return.

Exhibit "D", Annexed to Complaint.

109

The following tabulation shows the Federal estate tax liability of this estate which is hereby made final:

Gross estate		3,781,604.15
Deductions, 1926 Act		585,533.21
Net estate, 1926 Act		3,196,070.94
Net estate, 1932 Act		3,256,070.94
Gross tax, 1926 Act	$ 262,028.51	
Credit for estate or inheritance taxes	0.00	
Net tax, 1926 Act		262,028.51
Total gross taxes, 1926 and 1932 Acts	1,065,271.21	
Gross tax, 1926 Act	262,028.51	
Additional tax		803,242.70
Total net tax		$1,065,271.21
Amount assessed on return		419,616.73
Deficiency		$ 645,654.48

110

111

No credit is allowed for either gift tax or State estate, inheritance, legacy or succession taxes at this time as the gift tax has not been finally determined and the inheritance tax credit evidence has not been submitted.

The deficiency bears interest at the rate of six per cent per annum from fifteen months after the decedent's death to the date of assessment, or to the thirtieth day after the filing of a waiver of the restrictions on the assessment, whichever is the earlier.

112 **Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Complaint.**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

SIRS:

YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, upon the complaint herein, a motion will be made at a term of this Court to be held in and for the Western District of New York, at the Courthouse thereof, Niagara Square, Buffalo, New
113 York, on the 28th day of August, 1939, at ten o'clock in the forenoon of said day (Eastern Daylight Saving Time), or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, for an order dismissing the complaint herein on the ground that the same fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action, and for such other, further and different relief as to the Court may seem just in the premises.

Dated, Buffalo, N. Y., August 7, 1939.

Yours, &c.,

GEORGE L. GROBE,
United States Attorney in and for
114 the Western District of New York,
Attorney for Defendant,
Office & P. O. Address,
502 United States Courthouse,
Buffalo, New York.

TO:

MONTGOMERY, PEABODY, GRACE & DERBY, Esqs.,
Attorneys for Plaintiff,
1 Cedar Street,
New York, N. Y.

WELLES V. MOOT, Esq.,
302 Erie County Bank Building,
Buffalo, New York.

Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Complaint 115

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

A motion having been made herein by the defendant to dismiss the complaint on the ground that the same fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action, and said motion having duly come on to be heard upon the 116
complaint herein, and the notice of motion herein, dated August 7, 1939, and after hearing Robert M. Hitchcock, Esq., Assistant United States Attorney, of counsel for the defendant in support of said motion, and James Lloyd Derby and Frederick P. King, Esqs., of counsel for the plaintiff in opposition thereto, and due deliberation having been had, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this Court that the complaint states a claim as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and this Court having handed down an opinion directing that the motion be denied, it is

117

ORDERED that said motion to dismiss the complaint herein be and the same is hereby in all respects denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the defendant may have twenty days after the service of a copy of this order with notice of entry in which to answer the complaint herein.

Dated, Buffalo, New York,
January 2nd, 1940.

JOHN KNIGHT
United States District Judge

118 **Opinion of Judge John Knight on Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Complaint**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

[SAME TITLE]

APPEARANCES:

119

MONTGOMERY, PEABODY, GRACE & DERBY; for Plaintiff; Frederick P. King and Hines, Rearick, Dorr & Hammond, of Counsel.

GEORGE L. GROBE, United States Attorney; Robert M. Hitchcock, Assistant United States Attorney; for Defendant.

KNIGHT, District Judge:

The Complaint and the briefs submitted by the respective parties on this motion to dismiss the complaint have
120 been examined with care, and it seems that this motion must at this time be denied. The question of the financial need of the donees may be an important question in connection with the effect of the substantial appropriation made by the court out of the estate of the incompetent. The matter of such need was not a jurisdictional fact requiring a recital in the order. Neither the petitions on which the orders were made nor the testimony taken by the Referee is before the court.

The question of prior gifts, and the amount of these, if any, made by deceased while competent, may, also, be a relevant inquiry.

Opinion of Judge John Knight on Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Complaint. 121

The claim is made that, since the argument of the government is not directed to certain allowances made to collateral relatives, the motion must be denied. If the court were to find no distinction between the effect of gifts to collaterals and to direct heirs, this point would be immaterial.

December 21, 1939

JOHN KNIGHT
United States District Judge 122

123

124 **Answer**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

[SAME TITLE]

The above named defendant, by his attorney, George L. Grobe, United States Attorney in and for the Western District of New York, as and for his answer to the complaint herein, alleges upon information and belief:

125 I. Denies any knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to each and every allegation contained in paragraphs numbered "3", "4", "5", "6", "7", "8", "9" and "10" thereof, and so much of "14" thereof as alleges that plaintiff "solely in order to avoid the imposition of penalties and interest, and the distraint and sale of the property in its custody as such administrator, and other compulsion, duress and coercion, paid * * *."

II. Denies each and every allegation contained in paragraphs numbered "17", "18" and "19" thereof.

WHEREFORE, defendant demands judgment dismissing
126 the complaint with costs.

Dated, Buffalo, N. Y., January 18, 1940.

/s/ George L. Grobe,
GEORGE L. GROBE,
United States Attorney in and for
the Western District of New York,
Attorney for Defendant,
Office and P. O. Address,
502 United States Courthouse,
Buffalo, New York.

(Verified by George L. Grobe, United States Attorney for the Western District of New York.)

Plaintiff's Notice to Admit Facts

127

IN THE

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

[SAME TITLE]

Sir:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Rule 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure the undersigned hereby 128
call upon you for the admission by you of the truth of the following matters relevant to the above entitled action:

1. That Helen Hall Vail, mentioned in paragraph marked "3" and subsequent paragraphs of the complaint herein, died on December 27, 1935.

2. That the plaintiff above named duly qualified and acted as Committee of the Property and Estate of said Helen Hall Vail until December 27, 1935.

3. That the said Helen Hall Vail from and after August 12, 1926, when plaintiff was appointed Committee of her Property, was herself incapable of pos- 129
sessing or exercising any intent whatsoever down to the time of her death.

Dated, April 24, 1941.

Yours, etc.,

MONTGOMERY, PEABODY, GRACE & DERBY,
Attorneys for Plaintiff,
Office and P. O. Address,
One Cedar Street,
Borough of Manhattan,
City of New York, N. Y.

130 *Affidavit of Assistant U. S. Attorney Robert M. Hitchcockwith Respect to Notice to Admit Facts.*

To:

GEORGE L. GROBE, Esq.,
United States Attorney,
Attorney for Defendant,
502 United States Court House,
Buffalo, New York.

---

131 **Affidavit of Assistant U. S. Attorney Robert M. Hitchcock with Respect to Notice to Admit Facts.**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

[SAME TITLE]

Western District of New York
County of Erie } ss:
132 City of Buffalo

ROBERT M. HITCHCOCK, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is an Assistant United States Attorney in and for the Western District of New York and as such has represented the defendant herein throughout the above captioned litigation.

That with respect to the notice to admit facts, dated April 24, 1941, and pursuant to Rule 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, defendant is unable to either admit or deny the truth of the three alleged facts contained in said notice.

Affidavit of Assistant U. S. Attorney Robert M. Hitchcock with Respect to Notice to Admit Facts.

That deponent knows nothing with respect to the first and second of said alleged facts except upon hearsay, although deponent has no basis whatsoever for denying the truth of the said facts.

That with respect to the third alleged fact, deponent can neither admit nor deny the same by reason of his complete ignorance of the mental condition of said Helen Hall Vail between August 12, 1926 and the date of her death, although deponent assumes by reason of hearsay information contained in the records of the New York State Supreme Court, examined in the files of the County Clerk of New York County, that said Helen Hall Vail was adjudicated an incompetent on or about August 12, 1926 and was, at that time at least, incapable of managing herself and her estate.

(Sworn to by Robert M. Hitchcock on April 28, 1941.)

136 **Testimony.**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

Tried before Hon. John Knight, United States District Judge, held at the United States Court House, Buffalo, New York, beginning May 6, 1941, at 10:00 A. M.

137

APPEARANCES:

Messrs. MONTGOMERY, PEABODY, GRACE & DERBY, Attorneys for the Plaintiff, by James Lloyd Derby, Esq., and J. Seymour Montgomery, Jr., Esq., of Counsel. (One Cedar St., N. Y. City.)

Messrs. MOOT, SPRAGUE, MARCY & GULICK, Attorneys for Plaintiff, by Welles V. Moot, Esq., of Counsel. (Erie County Bank Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.)

Messrs. HINES, REARICK, DORR & HAMMOND, Attorneys for Plaintiff, by John K. Watson, Esq., and Paul Smith,
138 Esq., of Counsel. (61 Broadway, New York City).

Messrs. DEAN, KING, SMITH & TAYLOR, Attorneys for Plaintiff, by Frederick P. King, Esq., of Counsel. (55 Liberty St., New York City.)

Hon. GEORGE L. GROBE, United States Attorney, Attorney for the defendant, by Robert M. Hitchcock, Esq., Assistant United States Attorney.

Mr. Hitchcock: Solely for the purpose of the record, I renew my motion made in June or July of 1939, to dis-

139

miss the complaint by reason of the failure of the parties to prove the facts which constituted their cause of action and which was denied by your Honor, and I respectfully except to your Honor's denial of my motion now.

BURRELL T. CAPPON, sworn on behalf of the plaintiff, testified as follows:

Direct Examination by Mr. Moot:

140

Q. Mr. Cappon, you are Clerk of the Surrogate's Court of Ontario County? A. Yes.

Q. That is at Canandaigua? A. Yes.

Mr. Hitchcock: What do you propose to prove by this witness?

The Court: You made a motion a while ago and I will pass on your motion. I didn't pass upon it then. I will deny your motion.

Mr. Hitchcock: I respectfully except to your Honor's denial of my motion, in view of your previous decision.

141

The Court: I recall no action was taken.

Mr. Hitchcock: I except.

Mr. Moot: Now, your question.

Mr. Hitchcock: I want to know what you propose to prove by it?

Mr. Moot: I propose to offer in evidence the return appraiser's report, taxing order, and receipt for the tax, on file in the Surrogate's office, Ontario County, in the New York State tax proceedings in the Estate of Mrs. Vail.

Mr. Hitchcock: I respectfully object to any such offer on the ground that it is incompetent and

142 *Burrell T. Cappon—For Plaintiff—Direct.*

immaterial, and irrelevant, and on the further ground it is res inter alois acta.

Mr. Moot: I stated the basis on which it is offered, on which this offer was being made. I stated it before, your Honor, and it is simply this; it will appear from the return, if the return is in evidence here, that the return is identical with the return filed in the Federal proceedings. The New York State Law is identical with the Federal Statute. It is also our contention that the Transfer Tax Ap-
143 praiser and taxing officer makes his report to the Surrogate's Court and the Surrogate in a judicial capacity, first as a pro forma matter, makes his order confirming this report, and then, if no objections are filed, and no hearing is asked for, that order becomes the final judicial determination of the amount of the tax.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Moot: I am willing to have your Honor reserve decision on this question, if you wish.

144 The Court: I have doubt about its admissibility, in view of your concession—but I will receive it, and simply reserve decision on it.

Mr. Hitchcock: I respectfully except to your Honor's ruling at this time.

The Court: I will pass on it. All right.

Mr. Moot: I would be glad to submit memoranda to your Honor on that basis.

Mr. Hitchcock: So that there will be no further interruption, my objections and exceptions are taken to any of the offers of reports in evidence, or anything in the Surrogate's Court of Ontario County. I assume your Honor will rule that it

145

isn't necessary for me to continue to make those objections?

The Court: Yes, that is right.

By Mr. Moot:

Q. Have you the return in the Vail Estate? A. Yes.

Q. Filed in Ontario County? A. Yes.

Q. In connection with the New York State Estate Tax? A. Yes.

Q. Are you willing to offer all these together, that we offer all these together?

146

Mr. Hitchcock: I object to all of this. I won't say a word now.

The Court: Are they certified copies?

Mr. Moot: We are just offering the originals at this time. If we may, we will have certified copies sent on.

The Court: Certified copies are admissible anyway.

Mr. Moot: Is that agreeable, to have him take the originals back and send certified copies on?

Mr. Hitchcock: Yes.

Mr. Moot: The appraiser's report also?

The Witness: Yes.

147

Mr. Moot: And taxing order?

The Witness: Yes.

Mr. Moot: And receipt for the tax?

The Witness: Yes.

Mr. Moot: I offer this in evidence as one exhibit, with the understanding the Court reserves decision as to whether or not they are admissible.

The Court: Yes.

(Appraiser's report, taxing order, receipt for the tax, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 in evidence.)

148 *Burrell T. Cappon—For Plaintiff—Direct.*

Mr. Moot: And certified copies will be supplied by the Surrogate's Court.

The Court: Very well.

Mr. Moot: Was any appeal taken from the taxing order?

Mr. Hitchcock: I object to that on the ground that it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial and res inter alios acta.

Mr. Moot: He can supply us with formal certificate of such appeal, but I want to get in the record that there
149 was no appeal.

Mr. Hitchcock: May I have a ruling?

The Court: I assumed that there was no appeal. Wouldn't the burden rest on somebody else?

Mr. Moot: You have no objection to my getting a certificate of no appeal? You have the same objection to that?

Mr. Hitchcock: I object on the grounds I have stated, and I would like a ruling on my objection.

The Court: I don't think that is material. Here is a court of record of the Surrogate's Court—

Mr. Moot: We want to show there is no appeal pending.

150 The Court: I will reserve my decision on each of these questions.

Mr. Moot: You can send certified copies of these papers and certificate of no appeal?

The Witness: Yes.

(Certificate of no appeal marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: You may ask.

Mr. Hitchcock: I have no questions.

The Court: We will recess until 2 o'clock.

(Recess until 2 o'clock P. M.)

Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.

151

After Recess, 2 P. M.

Mr. Moot: We have a certified copy of Letters of Administration.

Mr. Hitchcock: No objection.

(Certified copy of Letters of Administration marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: And the short form certificate of letters of administration.

The Court: Of appointment?

152

Mr. Moot: Yes.

Mr. Hitchcock: No objection.

(Short form certificate of letters of administration marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I have a certified copy of the inquisition in the matter of the appointment of a Committee of the Person and Property of Helen Hall Vail.

Mr. Hitchcock: I object to that, solely on this ground: The complaint alleges Helen Hall Vail was adjudicated an incompetent in New York County, whatever date it was, in a court of competent jurisdiction. I don't know if that is of any materiality here or whether it isn't, but for the purpose of the record I object to it on the ground it has no material jurisdiction, because the other evidence in the case shows she was a resident of Ontario County, New York, and actually domiciled and living in the State of New Jersey, and what jurisdiction the Sheriff's jury of New York County Supreme Court had over her person and property so as to permit an adjudication as to her competency isn't clear to me at all.

153

The Court: It isn't admitted in the answer?

154 *Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.*

Mr. Hitchcock: We deny any knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the answer in the complaint which recites those facts.

The Court: Don't the documents themselves show presumptive evidence of jurisdiction?

Mr. Hitchcock: I assume they would. I don't know.

The Court: I will overrule the objection.

Mr. Hitchcock: Exception.

Mr. Moot: This lady had a home in New Jersey and one in New York, and lived at the Plaza.

155 (Inquisition marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: Now, I would like to call your Honor's attention to the inquisition (showing paper to Court).

I offer certified copy of Order of August 12, 1926, appointing Committees.

Mr. Hitchcock: Same objection.

Mr. Moot: I offer that in evidence.

The Court: Objection overruled.

Mr. Hitchcock: Exception.

(Certified copy of Order of August 12, 1926, appointing Committees marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 in evidence.)

156 Mr. Moot: I offer in evidence certified copy of Commission to Committees, dated August 25, 1926.

Mr. Hitchcock: No objection.

(Certified copy of Commission to Committees, dated August 25, 1926, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 7 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I now offer in evidence the original commitment. The original commitment and order.

Mr. Hitchcock: For the record, I make the same objection and take the same exception.

157

Mr. Moot: This order is in Orange County, which is the place where the institution was located in which she was confined, made by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Hitchcock: Orange County, New Jersey, or Orange County, New York?

Mr. Moot: New York.

(Commitment petition and order received and marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 8 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I now offer in evidence the various papers filed with the 1926 allowance proceeding. First, the petition of M. H. Plumb. I think those papers are attached 158
to it (indicating).

The Court: They are attached to the pleadings?

Mr. Moot: Attached to the deposition.

Mr. Hitchcock: They are marked for identification; they were marked for identification on the deposition of Judge Lydon?

Mr. Moot: Yes, and attached to his deposition.

The Court: You are going to read them?

Mr. Moot: I will just read the ones I am offering in evidence.

Mr. Hitchcock: The less confusing procedure would be if you read the deposition, and if the exhibit is referred 159
to in the proper place in the deposition, that be put in at that time.

Mr. Moot: We will offer that deposition later.

The Court: It will be part of the deposition, attached to the deposition, and part of the 1926 allowance proceedings?

Mr. Moot: Yes, and I thought I would offer them with the allowance proceedings, to make that complete. We will offer the deposition.

Mr. Hitchcock: Wouldn't it be less confusing to take Judge Lydon's deposition, and, after you read it, those

160 papers are referred to there, they can be offered in evidence, and we are talking about the same thing here as before Judge Lydon.

Mr. Moot: The difficulty is you are taking Judge Lydon's deposition before you have the papers in the hearing before him.

The Court: Have you a certified copy of the record of the proceedings before him?

Mr. Moot: We haven't a certified copy of these papers because they are attached to that and we thought we would use them here.

161 The Court: What do you seek now to introduce?

Mr. Moot: The 1926 allowance proceedings.

The Court: Taken before Judge Lydon?

Mr. Moot: No, I am offering now the 1926 allowance proceedings before Judge Lydon.

The Court: That is what I mean.

Mr. Moot: After the institution of this action we went down and examined Judge Lydon as to his intent.

The Court: What you are offering now is the proceeding taken on the application for allowance?

Mr. Moot: Yes, that is right. First I offer the petition of Mrs. Plumb.

162 Mr. Hitchcock: I object to it, to the order in which it is offered, and solely to that.

The Court: That is all right. There may be some duplication, but that is all right. It is a separate proceeding. That is attached to the exhibit. What is the number there?

Mr. Moot: If the stenographer will make a note of it we will let him mark them later.

(Petition of M. H. Plumb marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 9 in evidence.)

Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.

163

Mr. Hitchcock: That is the same as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 for identification referred to in the deposition. That is agreed?

Mr. Moot: I am checking it. Yes, all right; that is right.

Mr. Hitchcock: All right.

Mr. Moot: I offer the answer and cross petition of Farmers Loan & Trust Co., in the 1926 proceedings. It is Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 in the deposition.

(Answer and cross petition of Farmers Loan & Trust Co. in the 1926 proceedings marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 10 in evidence.) 164

Mr. Moot: The notice of appearance of Ieuan Harris as general guardian in the 1926 proceedings.

Mr. Hitchcock: That is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 for identification in the deposition.

Mr. Moot: Yes.

Mr. Hitchcock: All right.

(Notice of appearance of Ieuan Harris as general guardian in the 1926 proceedings marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 11 in evidence.) 165

Mr. Moot: I offer the Order appointing Referee in the 1926 allowance proceeding.

Mr. Hitchcock: That is Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 for identification in the deposition?

Mr. Moot: Yes.

Mr. Hitchcock: All right.

(Order appointing Referee in the 1926 proceeding marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 12 in evidence.)

166 *Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.*

Mr. Moot: I next offer notice of hearing before Referee in the 1926 allowance proceedings.

Mr. Hitchcock: Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 for identification in the deposition.

(Notice of hearing before Referee in the 1926 allowance proceedings marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 13 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer the testimony before the Referee in the 1926 allowance proceeding.

167 Mr. Hitchcock: Plaintiff's Exhibit 7 for identification in the deposition.

(Testimony before Referee in the 1926 allowance proceeding marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 14 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer the report of the Referee.

Mr. Hitchcock: That is Plaintiff's Exhibit 8 for identification in the deposition?

Mr. Moot: Yes.

(Report of Referee marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 15 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: Now, the Order of January 14, 1927, granting allowance.

168 Mr. Hitchcock: Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 for identification in the deposition.

(Order of January 14, 1927, granting allowances marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 16 in evidence.)

Mr. Hitchcock: That is also attached to the complaint, Counsel.

Mr. Moot: Those are all the exhibits offered in connection with the deposition.

Mr. Hitchcock: That is all of them, yes.

Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.

169 Mr. Moot: I have a memoranda here of exhibits in connection with the 1926 allowance proceedings not offered here; I would be glad to give a copy of it to the stenographer, if you would like to have it.

M. Hitchcock: What is the purpose?

Mr. Moot: We don't consider them important.

Mr. Hitchcock: We don't either, so far as that goes.

Mr. Moot: We will omit that.

Mr. Hitchcock: We will take a glance at it, to be sure.

Mr. Moot: If I may put it in the record?

170 Mr. Hitchcock: Don't clutter up this record with something that everybody agrees is not important.

The Court: It hasn't been offered.

Mr. Moot: Very well. I will withdraw that, then, your Honor. I don't care about it. They are not important now. On this 1926 allowance proceedings I thought at this time I would not take the time to read from the testimony before the Referee, for the reason you doubtless will look it over, and we covered it rather fully this morning. To save time, there is only one thing I will comment on, and that is in the report of the Referee. (Mr. Moot quotes from page 7 of Referee's report.)

171 Mr. Moot: I wish to offer a similar group of papers in connection with the 1932 allowance proceedings.

The Court: These items which you wish to introduce, I think it would be sufficient that they are all marked and received in evidence, and the objection noted to each at this time.

Mr. Hitchcock: I haven't objected to any of these yet, but I see no point in reading portions or smatterings from any of these exhibits that will have to be briefed and discussed.

The Court: You got the list here?

Mr. Moot: Yes, same as I have given to your Honor.

172 *Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.*

The Court: That can be marked later.

Mr. Hitchcock: State what you are offering. I don't have any objection to any of them.

The Court: Read them, yes.

Mr. Hitchcock: I don't know about these 1932 proceedings. I am familiar with the others.

The Court: You are offering petition of Mrs. Plumb, with notice of motion?

Mr. Moot: Yes. I offer that.

173 (Petition of M. H. Plumb, with notice of motion, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 17 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer in evidence notice of appearance of City Bank Farmers Trust Co. in evidence.

(Notice of appearance of City Bank Farmers Trust Co. marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 18 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer answer of Committee of the Property.

(Answer of Committee of the Property marked Plain-
174 tiff's Exhibit 19 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer notice of appearance of Ieuan Harris as general guardian.

(Notice of appearance of Ieuan Harris as general guardian marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 20 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer answer of Ieuan Harris as general guardian.

(Answer of Ieuan Harris as general guardian marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 21 in evidence.)

Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.

175

Mr. Moot: I offer affidavit of Dr. Neumann of May 3, 1932.

(Affidavit of Dr. Neumann of May 3, 1932, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 22 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer order of May 4, 1932, appointing special gurdian and referee.

(Order of May 4, 1932, appointing special guardian and referee, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 23 in evidence.)

176

Mr. Moot: I offer answer of Special Guardian for Incompetent.

(Answer of Special Guardian for Incompetent marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 24 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer notice of hearing before the Referee.

(Notice of hearing before the Referee marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 25 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer testimony before the Referee.

177

(Testimony before the Referee marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 26 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer notice of presentation of Referee's report.

(Notice of presentation of Referee's report marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 27 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer report of Referee.

178 *Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.*

(Report of referee marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 28 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I offer Order of May 31, 1932, amending title and prayer of petition. That is the one to which Mr. Hitchcock referred this morning, changing from $150,000 to $25,000 per annum.

(Order of May 31, 1932, amending title and prayer of petition, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 29 in evidence.)

179 Mr. Moot: I offer Order of June 3, 1932, granting allowances.

(Order of June 3, 1932, granting allowances, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 30 in evidence.)

Mr. Hitchcock: We will stipulate that Judge Ingraham is dead. The time isn't important.

Mr. Moot: He died on April 30, 1934.

Mr. Hitchcock: It is so stipulated.

Mr. Moot: I am not going to read from the testimony in that proceeding either, but I do wish to call your
180 attention to one or two things in the Referee's report, in this second proceeding. On page 5 Mr. Morgan reports no Will of the Incompetent having been discovered—(Mr. Moot reads pages 5, 7, 11 of Referee's report in second proceeding).

Mr. Hitchcock: You better get it marked now.

Mr. Moot: I offer report of Special Guardian.

(Report of Special Guardian marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 31 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I now offer in evidence proof in the intermediate account; first the account.

181

Mr. Hitchcock: That is all objected to, because as I assume—and if I am wrong you correct me—you are referring to the intermediate accounting by the Committee during the incompetency of Mrs. Vail?

Mr. Moot: Yes, I am offering the intermediate judicial settlement of the account, or proceedings of the City Bank Farmers Trust Co. as Committee of the Incompetent Helen Hall Vail.

Mr. Hitchcock: I object to it. There is no relevancy to any issue involved here.

Mr. Moot: This intermediate accounting is—

182

The Court: That is a judgment of February 20, 1934, settlement, settling the account.

Mr. Moot: Proof under the intermediate accounting. It goes down to April 1, 1933.

The Court: I assume you mean the extent of her Estate is going to be considered in determining the question of intent?

Mr. Moot: And the amount of disbursement and increase in surplus.

The Court: Overruled.

Mr. Hitchcock: Exception.

(Account above described marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 32 in evidence.) 183

Mr. Hitchcock: That is just the account itself?

Mr. Moot: Yes.

The Court: Do you have below this a final accounting?

Mr. Moot: I have next a supplemental account to bring it to July 1, 1933.

Mr. Hitchcock: Same objection.

The Court: Same ruling.

Mr. Hitchcock: Same exception.

(Supplemental account above described marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 33 in evidence.)

184 *Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.*

Mr. Moot: Next I offer report of the Special Guardian for the Incompetent.

Mr. Hitchcock: Same objection.

The Court: Same ruling.

Mr. Hitchcock: Same exception.

(Report of Special Guardian for the Incompetent marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 34 in evidence.)

Mr. Hitchcock: In what proceeding?

185 Mr. Moot: Intermediate judicial settlement of the account.

Mr. Hitchcock: I object to it on the ground it is immaterial for any purpose and irrelevant.

The Court: I don't see that the report of the Special Guardian is immaterial. It may be considered with the account itself.

Mr. Moot: Judgment of February 20, 1934, settling the account.

Mr. Hitchcock: Same objection.

Mr. Moot: It shows he checked everything, this report of Special Guardian.

Mr. Hitchcock: I object to the judgment.

186 The Court: Same ruling.

Mr. Hitchcock: Same exception.

(Judgment of February 20, 1934, settling account, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 35 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: Now I have the proof of final accounting.

Mr. Hitchcock: Same objection.

The Court: What is the date of her death?

Mr. Moot: December 1935, December 27th.

The Court: All right, all right.

Mr. Hitchcock: I object.

187

The Court: Overruled.
Mr. Moot: I offer this final account.

(Final account marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 36 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: Next I offer final order of December 9, 1936, settling the final account.
Mr. Hitchcock: Same objection.
The Court: Same ruling.
Mr. Hitchcock: Exception.

188

(Final order of December 9, 1936, settling final account, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 37 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: I wish to offer in evidence original Federal Estate Tax return on Form 706.

(Original Federal Estate Tax return on Form 706 marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 38 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: This is just formal proof, your Honor. I offer original claim for refund.
Mr. Hitchcock: No objection.

189

(Original claim for refund marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 39 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: This is the original letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to the City Bank Farmers Trust Co., dated November 3, 1937. I offer that.
Mr. Hitchcock: No objection.

(Original letter from Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated November 3, 1937, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 40 in evidence.)

190 *Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.*

Mr. Moot: Next the letter dated April 5, 1938, the 90-day letter.

Mr. Hitchcock: No objection.

Mr. Moot: From the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to City Bank Farmers Trust Co., dated April 5, 1938.

(Letter dated April 5, 1938, from Commissioner of Internal Revenue, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 41 in evidence.)

191 Mr. Moot: Next, notice and demand for payment of $436,031.67, and interest of $30,880.60, stamped paid June 22 1938.

Mr. Hitchcock: No objection.

(Notice and demand for payment of $436,031.67 and interest of $30,880.60, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 42 in evidence.)

Mr. Moot: Letter from Treasury Department, dated July 28, 1938, rejecting claim for refund, from the Treasury Department to the City Bank Farmers Trust Co.

192 (Letter from Treasury Department, dated July 28, 1938, marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 43 in evidence.)

* * * * * * * * *

Mr. Moot: Plaintiff rests, your Honor.

The Court: Plaintiff rests?

Mr. Moot: Yes.

Mr. Hitchcock: I renew my motion made at the opening of the case to dismiss the complaint because of failure to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.

193

The Court: I will reserve my decision on that motion.

Mr. Hitchcock: The defendant moves to dismiss the complaint because of the failure of the plaintiff to prove the cause of action as alleged in the complaint, or any cause of action.

The Court: Same action taken.

Mr. Hitchcock: The Government moves for a directed verdict in favor of the Government on the same ground, that there is no evidence here alleging the plaintiff to have sustained its position in support of the cause of action alleged in the complaint, or any cause of action.

194

The Court: Same ruling.

Mr. Hitchcock: I will note an exception. I will note an exception to your Honor's failure to grant my motions.

The Court: Motions denied.

Mr. Hitchcock: Exception.

(Discussion had off the record.)

Mr. Hitchcock: I offer in evidence individual income tax return for the year 1927 showing net income of $194,000 plus, for Mr. Harris, Geneva, New York. I offer that in evidence.

Mr. Moot: I object to that. I object to it on the ground it is incompetent, irrelevant, and not an issue in this case in any way. Mr. Harris testified that he wasn't in need of any financial assistance, and never had been, and there never was any claim of need on the part of the Harrises. It is entirely immaterial what his income was, whether it was ten dollars or a hundred thousand dollars or two hundred thousand dollars.

195

Mr. Hitchcock: Judge Lydon didn't think so. He said if he had known it, he wouldn't have made the gift.

Mr. Moot: That goes only to the question of amount, and the Judge answered that question. To bring in outside facts, what Mr. Harris' income was, is to get in some other issues. I don't believe they are competent.

The Court: I will receive it.

196 *Offering of Exhibits in Evidence.*

(Income tax return for the year 1927 of Mr. Harris, Geneva, New York, received in evidence and marked Defendant's Exhibit "A".)

Mr. Hitchcock: I make the same offer with respect to the tax return for the calendar year 1928 of the same taxpayer, showing a net income of one hundred and eighty-two thousand plus dollars.

Mr. Moot: I object on the same ground, and add to that objection of mine that the record can not be properly added to now, this record, testimony of Judge Lydon.

197

The Court: Overruled.

Mr. Moot: Exception.

(Income tax return for the year 1928 of Mr. Harris, received in evidence and marked Defendant's Exhibit "B".)

Mr. Hitchcock: I offer in evidence tax return for the calendar year 1929 of the same taxpayer, Mr. Harris, in the amount of one hundred and eighty-four thousand plus dollars.

198 Mr. Moot: Same objection.

The Court: Same ruling.

Mr. Moot: Exception.

(Tax return for year 1929 of Mr. Harris, received in evidence and marked Defendant's Exhibit "C".)

Mr. Hitchcock: The same thing for the calendar year 1930, showing net income of one hundred and ninety-six thousand plus dollars.

Mr. Moot: Same objection.

The Court: This is Harris?

199

Mr. Hitchcock: Yes, the father of these children.
The Court: Overruled.
Mr. Moot: Exception.

(Tax return for year 1930 of Mr. Harris, received in evidence and marked Defendant's Exhibit "D".)

Mr. Hitchcock: Those are the originals. May I have photostats substituted for them, which are not available at the moment? They will be sent from Washington. We are not permitted to leave these here, and if Counsel desires copies, I will send them photostats.

200

Mr. Moot: Haven't you present in the record everything you want in connection with those returns? I object to the admission of anything else. I object to anything else there, except the amounts. I have objected to the whole thing, but I object very particularly to any reason for putting in anything else.

Mr. Hitchcock: Maybe we can agree with that. Just a minute. Suppose I read from those what the gross as well as the net is, and then I am content to leave that in the record.

Mr. Moot: I object to that. These are of a confidential nature; under the Statute they are confidential, and I do not believe Counsel has any right to take these returns from the files of the defendant and use them in this case.

201

Mr. Hitchcock: If you take that position, I will ask for an adjournment and have a subpoena served on one Mr. Harris to be brought in Court and testify what the gross and net returns were for those years in question, if you want it that way.

Mr. Moot: I do not see that the gross return has anything to do with it. You have given the net figures in the case.

202

The Court: Can't we stipulate this? You are both familiar with the amounts. Can't we stipulate the gross and net incomes?

Mr. Hitchcock: I will read from the exhibit received in evidence.

Mr. Moot: You have read the net income for those years.

Mr. Hitchcock: You can examine them. Here is the gross shown.

Mr. Moot: I object to that. I do not see that the gross has any bearing on it. That is entirely confidential

203 information.

The Court: I will receive this. You stipulate the amount of the net income.

Mr. Hitchcock: We want the gross.

The Court: Then you get into the question of expenses and money expended on these things, and I don't believe you should go into it.

Mr. Hitchcock: The gross shows what he had available to use.

The Court: If you are going into the gross as well as the net, you are going into deductions and losses and everything else. For the purpose of this suit, this income

204 is sufficient.

Mr. Hitchcock: I will take an exception to your Honor's ruling preventing us from putting in the gross income; the net income is on the record, so that there will be no necessity of marking or submitting photostats of these exhibits. Defendant rests.

I renew my motion and ask for a directed verdict on the grounds made at the conclusion of the Plaintiff's case.

The Court: Same ruling.

Mr. Hitchcock: Same exception.

The Court: I will reserve decision.

PROCEEDINGS CLOSED.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.

205

Total Amounts of Schedules A, B and C of the New York Estate Tax Return.

Schedule A	$ 34,000.00
Schedule B	1,612,686.00
Schedule C	507,652.65

Schedule E of New York Estate Tax Return.

TRANSFERS

206

Transfers made in contemplation of death

NONE

Transfers not admitted to have been made in contemplation of death:

Pursuant to application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, decedent's daughter, the Supreme Court, New York County, made an order dated January 14, 1927, authorizing and directing City Bank Farmers Trust Company (then known as Farmers' Loan and Trust Company), as the duly appointed and acting Committee of the property of the decedent who was at that time an incompetent person, to pay out of the unexpended income of the decedent (then incompetent), the following sums annually:

207

To MaBelle Houghton Plumb, daughter	$50,000
To Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren	50,000
To Edward Hageman Hall, brother	2,000
To Mary Hall Taft, sister	3,000
To Elizabeth Hall Burdick, sister	2,000
To Abee Ferrin, sister	2,000
To Lucy Hall Ferrin, sister	2,000

208 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.*

Pursuant to a further application made by said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the Supreme Court, New York County, made an order dated June 3, 1932, granting additional allowances out of the unexpended income of the decedent (then incompetent) to be paid by said City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee. Said increases were made retroactive for a period of five years, and increased the allowances to said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and the Guardian for the infant grandchildren to the extent of $25,000 per annum each. The total amount of all allow-
209 ances out of the incompetent's income paid under the said orders of January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932, is $1,377,866.67. True copies of said orders are attached to this return.

The foregoing allowances made by the Court have been characterized by the Appellate Division as "gifts" and are, therefore, not taxable as transfers or advancements. (See *Matter of Farmers' Loan & Trust Company*, 181 App. Div. 642.)

Recapitulation from Report of New York Estate Tax Appraiser, dated June 27, 1936.

210

Personal Property	$2,281,463.23
Real Estate	$ 34,000.00
Total	$2,315,463.23
Debts, expenses and commissions	$ 480,222.09
Net estate	$1,835,241.14

Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.

211

Order of Surrogate's Court, Ontario County, New York, Fixing Tax.

AT A SURROGATE'S COURT held in and for the County of Ontario, at the Surrogate's office, in the city of Canandaigua, N. Y., on the 26th day of June, 1936.

Present, HON. FRED D. CRIBB, Surrogate.

212

IN THE MATTER

of the

APPRAISAL OF THE ESTATE OF
HELEN HALL VAIL

Deceased.

On reading the report filed the 26th day of June, 1936 of Lee H. Leland, Esq., the appraiser appointed by order of this Court, dated the 26th day of June, 1936, and it appearing that the said decedent died on the 27th day of December, 1935, it is

213

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the market value of the gross estate of said decedent at the time of death, the amount of exemptions and deductions allowed from said gross estate, the net amount of said estate which is subject to tax under the provisions of Article 10-C of the Tax Law, and the amount of tax to which the same is liable, shall be and the same hereby is assessed, fixed and determined as follows:

214 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.*

Gross estate	$2,315,463.23
Total deductions allowed by statute	480,222.09
Net estate	$1,835,241.14

Tax on net estate not in excess of $150,000, less $20,000.00 exemptions allowed under Section 249-q	$ 1,300.00
$ 50,000.00	1,000.00
100,000.00	3,000.00
200,000.00	8,000.00
215 200,000.00	10,000.00
200,000.00	12,000.00
200,000.00	14,000.00
500,000.00	40,000.00
235,241.14	21,171.71
Total Tax	$110,471.71

FRED D. CRIBB
Surrogate.

216

217

Plaintiff's Exhibit 2.

ONTARIO COUNTY SURROGATE'S OFFICE
Canandaigua, New York

STATE OF NEW YORK

SURROGATE'S COURT : ONTARIO COUNTY.

In the Matter of the Estate Tax upon the Estate of HELEN HALL VAIL, late of the City of Geneva, County of Ontario, State of New York, deceased. 218

I, Burrell T. Cappon, Clerk of the Surrogate's Court of the County of Ontario, State of New York, do hereby certify that an estate tax was assessed by the State of New York against the estate of HELEN HALL VAIL, late of the City of Geneva, County of Ontario, State of New York, deceased, in the amount of $110,471.71.

I do further certify that the amount of said tax, less a rebate of five per centum thereon in the amount of $5,523.58, was duly paid as appears from a receipt showing payment in the amount of $104,948.13 on file in my office; that said receipt was duly signed by the Treasurer of the County of Ontario, State of New York, under date of June 27, 1936, and countersigned by the State Tax Commission of the State of New York, by W. E. Stephens, Deputy Tax Commissioner under date of June 29, 1936; that there were no penalties or interest imposed or charged; that no claim for refund of such taxes or any part thereof is pending and that no refund of such taxes or any part thereof has been authorized; that 219

220 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 3.*

no objection has been filed to the order fixing such tax nor is an appeal pending in said estate tax proceeding.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the Surrogate's Court of the County of Ontario, State of New York, this 7th day of May, 1941.

(Seal)

Burrell T. Cappon
Clerk, Surrogate's Court

---

221 **Plaintiff's Exhibit 3.**

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

To City Bank Farmers Trust Company of the City of New York in the County of New York and State of New York send Greeting:

Whereas, Helen Hall Vail late of the City of Geneva in the County of Ontario, and State of New York, died on or about the 27th day of December, 1935, intestate:

And Whereas, On the 10th day of February, 1936, at a Surrogate's Court, held at Canandaigua, in and for
222 our County of Ontario, a decree was duly made, awarding Letters of Administration upon the estate of the said deceased to you: And you having taken your official consent, and duly filed with the Surrogate of our said County of Ontario the said consent required by law:

Now, Therefore, Know ye that we, having full faith and confidence in your competency, have granted, and by these presents do grant unto you, the said City Bank Farmers Trust Company the Administration of all and singular the goods, chattels, and credits which were of the said deceased, hereby constituting and appointing you Administrator thereof.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 3. 223

WITNESS, Hon. Fred D. Cribb
Surrogate of our said County of Ontario, and the seal of our said Surrogate's Court, this
(L. S.) 10th day of February, in the year one thousand nine hundred and thirty-six,

Fred D. Cribb Surrogate.

I CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true copy of the Letters of Administration issued by me on the Estate of Helen Hall Vail, deceased. 224

Recorded and compared this 10th day of February, 1936.

Fred D. Cribb Surrogate.

STATE OF NEW YORK }
ONTARIO COUNTY SURROGATE'S OFFICE } ss.:

I, Burrell T. Cappon, Clerk of the Surrogate's Court of the County of Ontario, in the State of New York, do hereby Certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of Letters of Administration issued on the estate of HELEN HALL VAIL, deceased, with the record of the 225
original of said Letters of Administration in said Surrogate's Office, and that said copy is a correct transcript of the whole of said original record now remaining in said office.

WITNESS my hand and the seal of said Surrogate's Court, at Canandaigua, N. Y., this 15th
L. S. day of April, 1941.

BURRELL T. CAPPON,
Clerk, Surrogate's Court.

(Seal)

226

Plaintiff's Exhibit 5.

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY

IN THE MATTER of the Appointment of a Committee of the Person and a Committee of the Property of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

227 an alleged incompetent person

INQUISITION

Clerk's No. 28867—1926

Montgomery Peabody & Grace
Attorneys for Petitioner
No. 15 William Street
228 New York, N. Y.

Filed
Aug 12 '26
Co. Clerk's Office

Plaintiff's Exhibit 5. 229

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY

IN THE MATTER of the Appointment of a Committee of the Person and a Committee of the Property of HELEN HALL VAIL an alleged incompetent person.	INQUISITION

230

By virtue of a commission in the nature of a Writ de Lunatico Inquirendo, issued out of and under the seal of the Supreme Court for the County of New York, dated the 3rd day of August, 1926, an inquisition as to the competency, among other things, of HELEN HALL VAIL, was taken in the office of the Sheriff of the County of New York, Hall of Records, Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 11th day of August, 1926, before the three Commissioners herein, to wit: 231

Arthur Johns, Counselor-at-Law,
William H. Quinn,
Philip F. O'Hanlon, M. D.

twelve (12)

and before a jury of ~~fifteen (15)~~ indifferent persons qualified to serve, and not exempt from serving, as trial jurors in the Supreme Court for the County of New York, having been duly summoned, duly sworn and charged, and whose names are as follows: John H O'Brien, R W Bartram J G Batenson E E Wright

232 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 5.*

James O Stack Isaac Lewenthal Edward B Kelly Wm H Hamilton Emoy L Lyon E Lester Barnes Charles D. Draper & George W. Kavanaugh.

The said jurors, pursuant to the said inquisition, upon their oaths find and say:

1. That the said HELEN HALL VAIL, for at least twelve months last past has been and now is a lunatic, suffering from cerebral arterio-sclerosis, with dementia, hallucinations, and senile arterio-sclerotic chorea, together with
233 lack of insight and proper appreciation of her affairs and impairment of business judgment, and by reason thereof she is incapable of governing herself and managing her affairs and property, and incapable of properly taking care of her person, affairs and property. That the above condition still continues to exist at the present time.

2. That as far as has been brought to the knowledge of this commission and jury, the said Helen Hall Vail has not aliened any of her lands.

3. That the value of the real property of the said
234 Helen Hall Vail is as follows:

(a.) 30 acres or thereabouts, with improvements thereon, situated in the City of Geneva, County of Ontario, State of New York, of the assessed value of $41,200., and of the market value of approximately $100,000.

(b.) 15 acres or thereabouts, with improvements thereon, situated at Palm Beach, in the County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, of the assessed value of $59,460., and of the market value of approximately $75,000.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 5.

235

(c.) House and lot at Spring Lake, in the County of Monmouth, State of New Jersey, of the assessed value of $13,400., and of the market value of approximately $25,000.

4. That on the 10th day of August, 1926, there was on deposit with The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company of the City of New York to the account of the said Helen Hall Vail the sum of $17,972.55.

That the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company holds as Agent in the County of New York for the said Helen Hall Vail the following securities of a total value of $484,100.00. 236

Bond and Mortgages	Par Value	Rate		Interest Payable		
Hugh M. Inman John H Fredk C & Chas 42 W 57th St. N.Y.C. Part Int in 65000.00	40,000.00	5½		Jun	Dec	
Hoagland Corp 29/41 W 42nd St. & 34/48 W 43rd St. N.Y.C. Part Int in 2500000.00	9,100.00	5	15	Feb	Aug	237
Trustees of Columbia University	110,000.00	5	6	May	Nov	
Benjamin Winter N/E Cor 5th Ave & 43rd St	325,000.00	5	30	Apr	Oct	
	484,100.00					

238 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 5.*

That the said Helen Hall Vail is the life beneficiary of a Trust created under the Last Will and Testament of Charles F. Houghton, deceased, of which the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company is Trustee. That the said Trust constitutes the residuary estate of the said Charles F. Houghton, deceased.

That the income from the said Trust for the calendar year 1924 amounted to the sum of $298,499.59.

That the income from the said Trust for the calendar year 1925 amounted to the sum of $327,260.21.

239 That The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Trustee, on the 10th day of August, 1926, had income received to that date but unpaid in the sum of $255,141.70.

5. That said Helen Hall Vail also has jewelry, household furniture and personal effects in the several residential dwellings above mentioned, amounting in value in all to approximately $150,000.

6. That the total income of the said Helen Hall Vail derived from the foregoing trust and all other sources for the year 1925 (the income from the above mentioned invested surplus of income being estimated for the reason
240 that all said surplus income was not invested in the year 1925) amounted to the sum of $351,665.21.

7. That the said Helen Hall Vail is a widow, 74 years of age, and that her only next of kin and heirs at law are her daughter, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, who resides at No. 3 College Lane, in the City of Haverford, State of Pennsylvania, who is of full age and sound mind, and John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, the children of a deceased daughter of said Helen Hall Vail, who resides with their father, Ieuan Harris, in the City of Geneva, State of New York, and who are infants under the age of 14 years.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 5.

241

In Testimony Whereof the said Commissioners as well as the jurors aforesaid have to this inquisition set their hands and seals this 11th day of August, 1926.

Arthur Johns L. S.
Philip E. O'Hanlon, M. D. L. S.
William H. Quinn L. S.
Commissioners.

Jno. H. O'Brien L.S.
Ren W. Bartram L.S.
J. G. Batenson L.S.
E. E. Wright L.S.
James O. Stack L.S.
Isaac Lewenthal L.S.
Edward B. Kelly L.S.
Wm. H. Hamilton L.S.
Emoy L. Lyon L.S.
E. Lester Barnes L.S.
Charles D. Draper L.S.
George W. Kavanaugh L.S.
Jurors.

242

No. 16198

State of New York, }
County of New York, } ss.:

243

I, William T. Collins, Clerk of the said County and Clerk of the Supreme Court of said State for said County, Do Certify, That I have compared the preceding with the original certificate of inquisition on file in my office, and that the same is a correct Transcript therefrom, and of the whole of such original.

Indorsed Filed. Aug. 12, 1926.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, this 30 day of Aug. 1926.

William T. Collins,
Clerk.

244

Plaintiff's Exhibit 6.

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT,

NEW YORK COUNTY.

IN THE MATTER of the Appointment of a Committee of the Person and a Committee of the Property of

HELEN HALL VAIL

an alleged incompetent person.

245

FINAL ORDER APPOINTING COMMITTEES, ETC.

Clerk's No. 28867—26

MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE,
Attorneys for Petitioner,
Office & P. O. Address,
15 William Street,
Borough of Manhattan,
New York City.

246

ENTERED

Filed
Aug 13 '26
Co. Clerk's Office

Plaintiff's Exhibit 6.

247

At a Special Term of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, held in and for the First Judicial District at the County Court House in New York County, Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 12th day of August, 1926.

Present: Hon. Charles L. Guy, Justice.

In the Matter of the Appointment of a Committee of the Person and a Committee of the Property of

Helen Hall Vail

an alleged incompetent person.

Final Order Appointing Committee, etc. 248

Upon reading and filing the petition of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, duly verified August 12th, 1926, praying, among other things, that the findings of the Sheriff's Jury upon the execution of the commission heretofore issued herein, as contained and set forth in the inquisition returned thereon, be in all respects confirmed, and that MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner herein, be appointed committee of the person of the above named Helen Hall Vail, an alleged incompetent person, upon giving such security as shall be required by law, and as to the Court should seem proper, and that The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company of the City of New York, be appointed committee of the property and estate of the above named Helen Hall Vail, an alleged incompetent person, and for other relief; and upon reading and filing the affidavit of regularity herein, made by John D. Peabody and verified August 12th, 1926, attached to said petition; the affidavit respecting the amount of security

249

250 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 6.*

to be given by the committee of the person, made by John D. Peabody and verified August 12th, 1926, attached to said petition; the affidavit of John D. Peabody respecting the petitioner's necessary disbursements and costs and counsel fees, verified August 12th, 1926, attached to said petition; and upon reading and filing the affidavit of George H. Cowie, Esq., Special Guardian of said HELEN HALL VAIL, verified August 12th, 1926, and the affidavit of Thomas Keogh, Esq., Special Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris,
251 the infant next of kin of said HELEN HALL VAIL, verified August 11th, 1926; and upon all the papers heretofore filed, and upon all the proceedings heretofore had herein, and the matter having duly come on to be heard before this Court on August 11th, 1926, John S. Montgomery, Esq., of counsel for MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner herein, having duly appeared and been heard in support of the said petition, and George H. Cowie, Esq., Special Guardian for HELEN HALL VAIL, the alleged incompetent person, and Thomas Keogh, Esq., Special Guardian for John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, the infant next of kin of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, having
252 duly appeared and been heard, and due deliberation having been had thereon, and no objection having been made by the said Special Guardians,

Now, on motion of Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner herein, it is

ORDERED, that the findings of the Sheriff's Jury upon the execution of the commission in the above entitled proceeding, as set forth in the inquisition herein, dated August 11th, 1926, and duly filed in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York August 12th, 1926, be and the

253

same hereby are in all respects ratified, approved and confirmed; and it is further

ORDERED, that MaBelle Houghton Plumb, of No. 3 College Lane, Haverford, Pennsylvania, be and she hereby is appointed Committee of the person above named, upon filing with the Clerk of this Court a bond with sufficient sureties to be approved by a Justice of this Court, in the sum of Two Thousand Dollars, and conditioned that she will in all things faithfully discharge the trust imposed upon her and obey all directions of the Court in regard to the trust, make and render a just and true 254
account of all moneys and other properties received by her and the application thereof and of her acts in the administration of her trust whenever so required to do by the Court; and it is further

ORDERED, that The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company of the City of New York be and it hereby is appointed the committee of the property and estate of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person above named, without bond, upon the condition, however, that it will in all things faithfully discharge the trust imposed upon it and obey all directions of the Court in regard to the 255
trust, make and render a just and true account of all moneys and properties received by it, and the application thereof and of its acts in the administration of its trust whenever so required to do by the Court; and it is further

ORDERED, that the said committee of the property and estate is hereby vested with the usual powers prescribed by law, and that a commission be issued in due form of law, under the seal of this Court, to it as such committee; and it is further

256 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 6.*

ORDERED, that upon the due giving, filing and recording of such security as hereinbefore directed the said committee of the person shall be vested with the usual powers prescribed by law, and that thereupon a commission be issued in due form of law, under the seal of this Court, to her as such committee; and it is further

ORDERED, that the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as said committee of the property and estate of HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person herein, be
257 and it hereby is empowered, authorized and directed to expend the sum of Six Hundred ($600.) Dollars, with which to pay DR. HENRY ALSOP RILEY his fees for examination of said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, and his testimony before the commission; and the sum of Four Hundred and Fifty ($450.) Dollars with which to pay DR. LEON H. CORNWALL his fees for examination of said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, and his testimony before the commission; and the sum of One Thousand Dollars with which to pay DR. HENRY A. COTTON his fees for examination of said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, and his testimony before the commission; and the sum of Five Hundred Dollars
258 with which to pay DR. JAMES S. ALLEN his fees for testimony before the commission; and the sum of Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars with which to pay DR. WILLIAM STEINACH his fees for examination of said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, and his testimony before the commission; and it is further

ORDERED, that the said committee of the property and estate of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person herein named, be and it hereby is empowered and authorized to expend the sum of Two Hundred ($200.) Dollars with which to pay ARTUR JOHNS, ESQ., for his

services as commissioner, appointed by this Court on the said commission; the sum of Two Hundred ($200.) Dollars with which to pay WILLIAM H. QUINN, ESQ., for his services as commissioner, appointed by this Court on the said commission; the sum of Two Hundred ($200.) Dollars with which to pay PHILIP F. O'HANLON, M.D., for his services as commissioner, appointed by this Court on the said commission; the sum of Twenty-five hundred ($2500.) Dollars with which to pay GEORGE H. COWIE, ESQ., Special Guardian heretofore appointed by this Court for said HELEN HALL VAIL, which sum is hereby awarded him as such special guardian as an allowance herein; the sum of Fifteen Hundred ($1500.) Dollars with which to pay THOMAS KEOGH, ESQ., Special Guardian heretofore appointed by this Court for said John H. Parris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, the infant next of kin of said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, which sum is hereby awarded him as such special guardian as an allowance herein; the sum of Fifteen Thousand ($15,000.) Dollars with which to pay MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE, attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner herein, which sum is hereby awarded said firm as such attorneys for the petitioner herein, as and for their costs and counsel fees herein; and the sum of Three Hundred and Sixty-four & 72/100 ($364.72) Dollars with which to pay MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE, attorneys for said Mabelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner herein, which sum is hereby awarded said firm as such attorneys for the petitioner herein, as and for the necessary disbursements of the petitioner herein; and it is further

259

260

261

ORDERED, that all persons are hereby directed and commanded to deliver to The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as such committee of the property and estate of said

262 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 6.*

HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person herein named, upon demand and presentation of a certified copy of the said commission to committee, all property of the said incompetent person of every kind and nature which may be in their possession or under their control; and it is further

ORDERED, that the said The Farmers' Loan & Trust Company is hereby further required out of the property and estate and out of any moneys which shall come into its hands, after the payment of all the sums of money
263 herein directed to be paid, to provide for the support, maintenance, treatment and sustenance of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, so far as it receives income, funds or other property belonging to said incompetent person; and it is further

ORDERED, that the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, committee of the person of HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, and the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, committee of the property and estate of said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, be and they hereby are required so to provide for the said HELEN HALL VAIL, and to see that she is properly cared for in a manner
264 suitable to her means and social position; and it is further

ORDERED, that the said committee of the person of said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person herein named, and the said committee of the property and estate of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person herein named, or any party to this proceeding may apply at the foot of this final order for any necessary instructions and directions of this Court, upon giving due notice.

Enter

CHARLES L. GUY,
J. S. C.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 6.

265

No. 16201

State of New York, }
County of New York, } ss.:

I, WILLIAM T. COLLINS, Clerk of the said County and Clerk of the Supreme Court of said State for said County, DO CERTIFY, That I have compared the preceding with the original certificate of Final Order appointing Committees, etc., on file in my office, and that the same is a correct Transcript therefrom, and of the whole of such original.

266

Indorsed Filed. Aug. 13-1926.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, this 30 day of Aug., 1926.

WILLIAM T. COLLINS,
Clerk.

(Seal)

267

268 **Plaintiff's Exhibit 7.**

Index No. 28867
Year 1926

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY.

IN THE MATTER of the Appointment of a Committee of the Person and a Committee of the Property of

269 HELEN HALL VAIL,

an incompetent person.

COMMISSION TO COMMITTEES.

Montgomery, Peabody & Grace,
Attorneys for MaBelle Houghton
Plumb, Petitioner,
Office & P. O. Address,
15 William Street,
270 Borough of Manhattan,
New York City.

COMMISSION TO COMMITTEES.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
TO ALL TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS SHALL COME,

GREETING:

WHEREAS, by a certain inquisition taken at the Jury Room in the office of the Sheriff of the County of New York, in the Hall of Records, in the Borough of Manhattan,

Plaintiff's Exhibit 7.

City of New York, on the 11th day of August, 1926, by virtue of our commission in the nature of a writ de lunatico inquirendo on that behalf duly made and issued, it was found, among other things, that HELEN HALL VAIL, an alleged incompetent person, at the time of the taking of the said inquisition was an incompetent, and that she was unable to manage herself or her affairs, as by the said inquisition made and dated August 11th, 1926, and filed in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York on August 12th, 1926, will more fully appear, and for the care and custody of whom and for the management of whose property and estate it belongs to us in our Supreme Court to provide; and

WHEREAS, by an order duly made and entered on the 12th day of August, 1926, and entered in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the 13th day of August, 1926, in a proceeding in the Supreme Court of the County of New York, entitled "In the Matter of the Appointment of a Committee of the Person and a Committee of the Property of HELEN HALL VAIL, an alleged incompetent person", MaBelle Houghton Plumb, of the City of Haverford, State of Pennsylvania, was appointed committee of the person of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, upon giving and recording in the said Clerk's office a bond for the security required by law, in the sum of Two Thousand ($2,000.00) Dollars, to be approved by a Justice of said Court, and conditioned that said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, as such committee, would in all things faithfully discharge the trust imposed upon her and obey all directions of the Court in regard to the trust, make and render a just and true account of all moneys and other properties received by her and the application thereof, and of her acts in the administration of her trust whenever so required to do by the Court; and

WHEREAS, by said order bearing date the 12th day of August, 1926, The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company of

274 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 7.*

the City of New York was appointed committee of the property and estate of the said HELEN HALL VAIL without giving security, as by law provided, said appointment, however, being conditioned that said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as such committee, would in all things faithfully discharge the trust imposed upon it and obey all directions of the Court in regard to the trust, make and render a just and true account of all moneys and other properties received by it and the application thereof, and of its acts in the administration of its trust whenever so
275 required to do by the Court; and

WHEREAS, the security required by said order of the committee of the person has been duly executed and approved, and the same duly filed and recorded in the Clerk's office.

NOW, THEREFORE, KNOW YE, that we have given, granted and committed, and by these presents do hereby give, grant and commit unto the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, of the City of Haverford, State of Pennsylvania, the care and custody of the person of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, and that we have given, granted and committed and by these presents do hereby give, grant
276 and commit unto the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company of the City of New York, the possession, care and management of the property and estate, real as well as personal of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person;

AND the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company is hereby required to return and file in the office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court in the County of New York during the month of January, 1927, a just and true inventory, with the affidavit required by law annexed thereto, of the entire estate, real as well as personal, of the said HELEN HALL

Plaintiff's Exhibit 7.

277

VAIL, the incompetent person, stating the income and profits thereof and the debts, credits and effects of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, so far as the same shall have come to the knowledge of the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, and also to file in the office of the said Clerk annually thereafter a similar inventory and account, under oath, of the management of the said trust and of any other property and effects belonging to the said estate which it shall have since discovered, as required by the statutes and rules of this Court;

AND the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company 278
is hereby further required, out of the property and estate and out of any moneys which shall come into its hands after the payment of all the sums of money directed to be paid by the said order of confirmation and appointment, to provide for the support, maintenance, treatment and sustenance of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, and to provide for the proper maintenance, care and upkeep of the real estate belonging to the said HELEN HALL VAIL, so far as it receives income, funds or other property belonging to said incompetent person;

AND the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, as such committee of the person of HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent 279
person, and the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as such committee of the property and estate of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, are hereby further required to obey and abide by all orders relating to said trust as may hereafter be made in our said Court, and to render a full and just account of the execution of the said trust and of the property, effects and estate which shall come into their hands when and as often as they shall be required so to do by our said Court or any court of competent jurisdiction;

AND YOU, the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, committee of the person of HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person,

280 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 7.*

and The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, committee of the property and estate of the said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, are hereby required so to provide for the said HELEN HALL VAIL, and to see that she is properly cared for in a manner suitable to her means and social position.

WITNESS, the HONORABLE CHARLES L. GUY, one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, at the County Court House in the County of New York, in the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, this 25 day
281 of August, 1926.

WILLIAM T. COLLINS,
Clerk of the County of New York.

By the Court:

.....

Montgomery, Peabody & Grace,
Attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb,
Petitioner,
282 15 William Street,
Borough of Manhattan,
New York City.

No. 16189

Plaintiff's Exhibit 7.

283

State of New York, }
County of New York, } ss.:

I, William T. Collins, Clerk of the said County and Clerk of the Supreme Court of said State for said County, Do Certify, That I have compared the preceding with the original certificate of

Commission to Committees.

on file in my office, and that the same is a correct Transcript therefrom, and of the whole of such original. 284

Indorsed Filed. Aug 25—1926

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, this 30 day of Aug 1926.

William T. Collins,
Clerk.

285

286 **Plaintiff's Exhibit 9.**

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY

In the Matter
of the
application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB
for an allowance to be paid herself and
others from the income accruing each
287 year to HELEN HALL VAIL, an incompetent person.

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK:

Your petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, respectfully shows:

I. That she is a daughter of HELEN HALL VAIL and resides at No. 411 Lancaster Avenue, Haverford, Pennsylvania.

288 II. That said HELEN HALL VAIL was, on the 11th day of August, 1926, duly adjudged to be incompetent to manage herself and her affairs, by a Sheriff's Jury of New York County, duly called to inquire into said matter, and that by an Order of the Supreme Court of New York County, entered on the 12th day of August, 1926, the findings of the said Sheriff's Jury were in all respects ratified, approved and confirmed, and your petitioner was appointed the Committee of the Person of said HELEN HALL VAIL, and The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company was appointed the Committee of her property. That both the Committee of the Person and the Committee of the Property of said HELEN HALL VAIL have

Plaintiff's Exhibit 9.

duly qualified and are now acting as such. That, as your petitioner is informed and verily believes, the said HELEN HALL VAIL is suffering from cerebral arteriosclerosis, with dementia, hallucinations and senile arteriosclerotic chorea, and that her condition holds out no hope for recovery.

III. That said HELEN HALL VAIL is seventy-four years of age and is a widow.

IV. That said HELEN HALL VAIL is the owner of the following parcels of real property, each one of which has erected upon it a private dwelling; one parcel situated at Geneva, New York, which has a value of about $86,000., one parcel situated at Spring Lake, New Jersey, which has a value of about $25,000., and one parcel at Palm Beach, Florida, which has a value of about $75,000.

That said parcels of real property produce no income.

That the contents of the private dwellings on the said real property are worth about $89,000.

That the said incompetent has jewelry worth about $176,000.

That the said incompetent is the life beneficiary of a Trust created by the Last Will and Testament of Charles F. Houghton, deceased, her first husband. That said Trust consists of the residuary estate of said Charles F. Houghton, deceased, and now produces an annual income in excess of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars ($300,000.00). That said income is now paid to The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the property of the said incompetent.

That the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the Property of the said incompetent has in its possession and custody securities belonging to

292 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 9.*

said incompetent, consisting of bonds and mortgages of a value of approximately Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars ($700,000.00) together with unexpended income from the said Houghton Trust in the sum of approximately Twenty-one Thousand Dollars ($21,000.00).

That the total income of the said incompetent from said Houghton Trust and from said securities amounts to approximately Three Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($350,000.00), per annum.

293 V. That the said HELEN HALL VAIL was married in 1878 to Charles F. Houghton, who died on the 30th of March, 1896. That in the year 1902 the said HELEN HALL VAIL was married to Charles Vail who died in the year 1922. That the said HELEN HALL VAIL has had three children, all by her first marriage, one of whom, Florence Houghton, died without issue; one of whom, Laura Houghton Harris, died leaving three children, John H. Harris now eleven years of age, William R. Harris now nine years of age and David F. Harris now six years of age; and your petitioner, who is the only other and surviving child of said HELEN HALL VAIL. That the
294 said infant children of said Laura Houghton Harris, deceased, reside with their Father, Ieuan Harris, at Geneva, New York, and that Ieuan Harris has heretofore been appointed the General Guardian of the said three children and has duly qualified as such.

That in and by his Last Will and Testament the said Charles F. Houghton, deceased, the Father of your Petitioner and of said Laura Houghton Harris, deceased, gave, devised and bequeathed his residuary estate in trust, and directed the Trustee thereof to apply the rents, income and profits thereof to the use of said HELEN HALL VAIL during her life, and upon her death to divide the same into two equal parts, and to apply the income

295

of one of said parts to the use of his daughter, the said Laura Houghton Harris, deceased, during her life, and the income of the other of said parts to the use of your petitioner, during her life; with a further provision, that upon the death of either of said daughters leaving issue her surviving, the part so held in trust for her should vest in her issue, share and share alike.

That your petitioner has one child, Joseph H. Plumb, Junior, who is now thirteen years of age.

That the said Laura Houghton Harris died on the 31st day of August, 1925, and that prior to said date the said Helen Hall Vail had been in the habit of contributing out of the income received by her from said Trust created for her benefit by the said Charles F. Houghton, deceased, the Father of your petitioner various annual sums for the support and maintenance of her two daughters, the said Laura Houghton Harris, and your petitioner.

296

VI. That the said Helen Hall Vail has the following brother and sisters and no others:

Edward Hageman Hall, 68 years of age, residing at 702 West End Avenue, New York City.

297

Mary Hall Taft, 79 years of age, residing at 425 Central Avenue, Orange, New Jersey.

Elizabeth Hall Burdick, 72 years of age, residing at "Reed House", 537 West 121st Street, New York City.

Abbe Fermi, 66 years of age, residing at Wolf's Lane, Pelham Manor, New York, and

Lucy Hall Ferris, 64 years of age, residing at Farrand Avenue, Highland Park, Michigan.

298 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 9.*

That prior to the time when the said HELEN HALL VAIL became incompetent she had been in the habit of contributing various annual sums to the support and maintenance of her above named brother and sisters.

That all of said brother and sisters are in very poor circumstances, particularly the said Mary Hall Taft, who is practically destitute, and it is necessary for their maintenance and support that the assistance which the incompetent formerly gave to them when she was mentally competent to understand the situation should be
299 continued.

VII. That the said HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent person, is now at Dr. Macdonald's House, Central Valley, New York where she was placed by your Petitioner. That there she has a sitting-room, bedroom and bath, and all the comforts which her position and affluence entitle her to have and are possible under the circumstances.

That the cost of maintaining the said incompetent at said Dr. Macdonald's House, supplying her with clothes and other necessities for her care and maintenance and for her pleasure could not, because of her condition,
300 exceed the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000.00) per annum.

That after the payment of said sum for the maintenance and support of said incompetent there will be left in the hands of The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as Committee of her property, annually a balance of income amounting to about Three Hundred Thousand Dollars ($300,000.00), a sum far in excess of that required to maintain said incompetent and to provide her with every comfort.

WHEREFORE your petitioner prays for an order directing The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as Committee

Plaintiff's Exhibit 9.

301

of the Property of said incompetent, to pay annually to the following named persons, from the surplus income received by it as such Committee, such allowances as to the Court shall seem reasonable and proper: To your petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, a daughter of said incompetent; to said Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, to be applied by him to the maintenance and support of the said infant grandchildren of said incompetent; to said Edward Hageman Hall, a brother of said incompetent; to said Mary Hall Taft, a sister of said 302
incompetent; to said Elizabeth Hall Burdick, a sister of said incompetent; to said Abbe Fermi, a sister of said incompetent, and to said Lucy Hall Ferris, a sister of said incompetent; and that there may be allowed your petitioner such a sum for counsel fees herein, as the Court thinks reasonable; and that such other and further relief may be granted to your petitioner herein as shall be deemed proper.

Dated, New York, October 8th, 1926.

MaBelle Houghton Plumb
Petitioner. 303

Plaintiff's Exhibit 9.

304

State of New York, }
County of New York, } ss.:

MaBelle Houghton Plumb, being duly sworn, says: That she is the petitioner named in the above entitled proceeding; that she has read the foregoing petition and knows the contents thereof, and that the same is true to her own knowledge, except as to the matters therein stated to be alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, she believes it to be true.

305

MaBelle Houghton Plumb

Sworn to before me this
8th day of October, 1926.

Samuel P. Simms
Notary Public Bronx Co. Ctf.
filed N. Y. Co. No. 150

306

Plaintiff's Exhibit 10. 307

SUPREME COURT,

NEW YORK COUNTY

IN THE MATTER *of* the Application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB for an allowance to be paid herself and others from the income accruing each year to Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person	ANSWER AND CROSS-PETITION

308

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK:

The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent person, appearing herein by Geller, Rolston & Blanc its attorneys, for its answer to the petition herein of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and for its own petition for affirmative relief herein, respectfully shows:

I. That said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company is a domestic corporation and is the duly qualified and 309
acting Committee of the property of the above named Helen Hall Vail, having been duly appointed such Committee by an order of this Court duly made and entered on or about the 12th day of August, 1926.

II. That said Committee is informed and believes that said Helen Hall Vail has for many years been accustomed to contribute from her own funds towards the support and maintenance of certain of her relatives, as more fully set forth in the petition of MaBelle Houghton Plumb herein.

310 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 10.*

III. That said Committee is desirous of obtaining the instructions and directions of this Court as to whether or not the aforesaid contribution should be continued, and if so to what extent and for how long a time.

WHEREFORE the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee as aforesaid, respectfully prays that it be instructed and directed by this Court as to the course it should pursue as such Committee in respect of the matters and things set forth in the said petition of MaBelle Houghton Plumb and in this cross-petition, and that it
311 have such other or further relief in the premises as to this Court may seem just and proper.

Dated, New York, November 19, 1926.

THE FARMERS' LOAN AND TRUST COMPANY
As Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person

By W. B. CARDOZO
Vice President

Attest:

312 I. H. MEEHAN
Secretary.

GELLER ROLSTON & BLANC
Attorneys for The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent person.
22 Exchange Place,
New York, N. Y.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 10.

313

STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK } ss:

WILLIAM B. CARDOZO being duly sworn deposes and says: that he is a Vice President of The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, the petitioner named in the foregoing answer and cross-petition; that he has read said answer and cross-petition and knows the contents thereof, and that the same is true to his own knowledge except as to the matters therein stated to be alleged upon information and belief, and as to those matters he believes it to be true.

314

W. B. CARDOZO

Sworn to before me this
19th day of November, 1926

R. B. KNOX
Notary Public

315

316

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY

IN THE MATTER

of the

Application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB for the allowance to be paid herself and others from the income
317 accruing each year to HELEN HALL VAIL, an incompetent person.

165 Broadway
New York City.
December 15th, 1926.

Before: PHILIP J. DUNN, Referee.

Appearances:

MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE, Attorneys for Petitioner. Mr. Peabody and Mr. Montgomery, of Counsel.

318

DEAN, KING & SMITH, Attorneys for Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris. Mr. King, of Counsel.

GELLER, RALSTON & BLANC, Attorneys for the Farmers Loan & Trust Co. as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail. Mr. Egan, of Counsel.

IT IS STIPULATED between the attorneys for the respective parties (counsel for guardian not objecting) that the statu-

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

tory fees of the Referee be waived; and it is further stipulated that Gertrude A. Trepold be employed as stenographer to take and transcribe the minutes of this reference and that she be paid the sum of 30¢ a folio for the original and 10¢ a folio for each copy furnished. 319

The Referee states that he has taken and subscribed the statutory oath.

Mr. Montgomery: This, Mr. Dunn, is an application made by the daughter of an incompetent for an allowance to herself and the three children of a deceased daughter. These three children of the other daughter and Mrs. Plumb, represent all the next of kin of the incompetent. 320 At the same time, Mrs. Plumb, the daughter of the incompetent, is applying for an allowance to the brother and sisters of the incompetent who are all people of practically no means.

We will show you that the income of the incompetent this year amounted to $637,990.95 and that prior years it amounted to somewhat smaller sums. We will put Mr. Marks on the stand to prove that when he get here.

I will offer in evidence, Your Honor, an order dated the 12th day of August, 1926 entered in Special Term of the Supreme Court, County of New York, which confirms the findings of the Sheriff's Jury that Helen Hall Vail is 321 incompetent to manage her own affairs and appointing Mrs. MaBelle Houghton Plumb the Committee of her person and the Farmers Loan & Trust Company as Committee of her property.

Received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "1".

I offer in evidence the Commission to the Committees, that is, the Commission to the Farmers Loan & Trust Company as Committee of the property and to Mrs.

322 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

MaBelle Houghton Plumb as Committee of the person of the incompetent, dated the 25th day of August, 1926.

Received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "2".

Doctor Henry Alsop Riley, witness called on behalf of the Petitioner, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

323 By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. Will you please state your full name? A. Dr. Henry Alsop Riley.

Q. And your address? A. 870 Madison Avenue.

Q. Your occupation, doctor? A. Physician.

Q. Are you a qualified examiner in lunacy? A. I am.

Q. Do you know Mrs. Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent in this proceeding? A. I do.

Q. When did you see her last? A. A week ago last Sunday—December 5th, 1926.

Q. Will you please state where you saw her? A. I saw
324 her at Dr. Macdonald's House at Central Valley, New York.

Q. And did you examine Mrs. Vail? A. Yes.

Q. For what purpose did you examine her, doctor? A. To determine whether the condition which we had previously found was still continuing.

Q. Did you find that condition continuing? A. We thought it was.

Q. Did you sign a certificate of lunacy? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you give the date of that certificate? A. That same day.

Q. Will you please state what Mrs. Vail's condition is? A. Physically she seems in good condition, but men-

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

325 tally she is very much the same as when we previously examined her. She had the same characteristics which she had before, that is, rather constant activity, constant talking, almost garrulous, going from one subject to another without any real continuity of thought. She showed some of the same apparent delusions which she had before about some members of her family and the attorneys with whom she came in contact. She remembered us and called us by name. Altogether she seemed in a somewhat delapidated mental condition.

326 Q. Is there any technical name for her trouble? A. We believe that she was suffering from an arterio-sclerotic condition which is a condition of the blood vessels of the brain. It is what is technically called senile dementia. She also had certain physical evidences; grimacing; irregular movements of the hands and feet, which we call senile chorea.

Q. Doctor, what in your opinion are the chances of Mrs. Vail's recovery? A. I think they are very slight. You mean to the extent of taking care of herself and her property?

Q. Yes. A. I would say there is practically no possibility of it.

327 Q. From your knowledge and experience in lunacy matters, doctor, do you believe Dr. Macdonald's House to be a suitable place for Mrs. Vail to be confined? A. Yes, I consider it a very nice place.

Q. A perfectly proper place under her financial circumstances as far as you know? A. Yes, sir.

Referee: How old is the incompetent?

Witness: She says she is seventy-one, but I believe she is seventy-four. At least that is what I was told when I saw her first. Between seventy-three and seventy-four.

328 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Referee: How many examinations did you make?

Witness: This is the third time that I have seen her. I saw her twice in Trenton.

Referee: And the condition showed no improvement over the last examination.

Witness: I think she is a little quieter. I think she has adjusted herself to surroundings. It is quieter there than in Trenton. She didn't quite show the same amount of irritability which she showed at Trenton.

329 Referee: Is the disease from which she is suffering of a progressive nature?

Witness: It usually is, yes.

Referee: Is hers of a progressive nature?

Witness: It is such a short time, relatively speaking, and she has shown this adjustment, that I wouldn't say that the disease has shown any definite progression during the past four months.

Referee: These diseases, as a rule, are progressive in character?

Witness: Yes, sir, and quite slow.

Referee: You are satisfied that she is unable to take care of her property and of herself?

330 Witness: Yes, sir, I am.

Referee: Do you know what treatment she is getting down there at Dr. Macdonald's House at the present time?

Witness: I think it is mere physical care. There really isn't any treatment for that condition.

Referee: She has nurses—special nurses?

Witness: There was a nurse with her all the time we were there.

Examination by Mr. King:

Q. Doctor, did you testify who the doctor is who is in

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

charge of this sanitarium in which Mrs. Vail is staying? A. No, I didn't mention that. 331

Q. Who is in charge? A. Dr. Pilgrim.

Q. Do you know his first name? A. Charles Pilgrim.

Q. Do you know who had charge of that Sanitarium before Dr. Pilgrim assumed charge? A. No, I don't.

Q. Do you know whether it was Dr. Carlos Macdonald? A. I imagine it was, simply from the name, that's all.

Q. Dr. Carlos Macdonald specialized in mental cases? A. Yes.

Q. You know him by reputation? A. Yes, sir.

Q. He had a very well known reputation? A. Yes, sir. 332

Q. He specialized in mental and nervous diseases? A. Yes; he was a very well known alienist.

Q. Do you know whether that can be said of Dr. Pilgrim? A. I would say yes. He was formerly the head of the Lunacy Commission in Albany.

Q. Does he exercise personal supervision over this sanitarium where Mrs. Vail is staying? A. I should say so, yes. He was the one who directed the proceedings.

Q. He is familiar with Mrs. Vail's case? A. Oh, yes; I am sure so.

Q. In personal contact with her? A. Yes, sir.

333

Mr. Egan: No questions.

Referee: How long have you been engaged in practice?

Witness: Since 1912.

Referee: And you have been a commissioner in lunacy how long?

Witness: Almost the same length of time. Possibly three years later.

334 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Referee: You make a specialty of that practice?
Witness: Yes.

HENRY ALSOP RILEY.

Sworn to before me this
24th day of December, 1926.

PHILIP J. DUNN
Referee.

---

335 MARY HALL TAFT, witness called on behalf of the Petitioner having been first duly sworn by the Referee, testified as follows:

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. What is your full name? A. Mary Hall Taft.

Q. And what is your residence? A. 425 Central Avenue, Orange, New Jersey.

Q. Do you know Mrs. Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent in this proceeding? A. I do, she is my sister.

Q. How old is Mrs. Vail? A. Mrs. Vail is seventy-one years old. She was seventy-one on the 2nd of last August.

336 Q. Will you please state what, if any, allowance Mrs. Vail has in former times granted to you. A. Mrs. Vail has been extremely kind to me. After my husband's death a number of years ago, she knew that I was left penniless and she gave me certain money then, and for nearly every year since she has given me from five to six hundred dollars in cash each year. In addition to that, a great deal of the time she has dressed me and given me other gifts; has taken me on beautiful trips and things of that kind.

Q. When did these allowances and gifts cease? A. Only this last year; well, I should say this present year.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

Q. They ceased in 1925? A. Yes, the last gift from her was in November, 1925. 337

Q. Will you please state your age? A. Seventy-nine.

Q. What is your financial condition, Mrs. Taft? A. I have absolutely no resources now. For ten years after my husband's death, not immediately after, but when I was sixty-two I began to support myself and for ten years did so until the death of my oldest brother. Since that time I have been dependent entirely upon my relatives who have been exceedingly good to me.

Q. And largely upon the gifts that Mrs. Vail gave you? A. Well, things that Mrs. Vail gave me, and I want to give due credit to others, Dr. Hall and my sister who is dead. 338

Q. And those gifts which your other sister used to give you have now ceased? A. Yes, they ceased with her death. I have one dependent on me too.

Q. Who is that? A. My daughter.

Q. How old is she? A. Just fifty a month ago.

Q. And she depends upon you for support? A. She does.

Q. She is an invalid? A. There are times when she is able to do a little stenography and typewriting, but she earns very little—practically nothing. 339

Q. How many living brothers and sisters have you, Mrs. Taft? A. My brother Dr. Hall and four sisters.

Q. What are their names? A. Mrs. Burdick—

Q. What is Dr. Hall's address? A. Edward Hageman Hall, 154 Nassau Street.

Q. What is Mrs. Burdick's address? A. Reed House, 537 West 121st Street, New York City.

Q. And what is your other sister's name? A. Mrs. George H. Ferris.

Q. And her address? A. 210 Farrand Park Avenue, Highland Park, Michigan.

340 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Q. Have you any other sisters? A. Mrs. Ferrin.

Q. And what is her address? A. 616 Wolfs Lane, Pelham Manor, New York.

Q. Are there any others? A. No, I have given you all.

Q. Mrs. Vail is the fourth sister? A. Yes.

Q. Mrs. Taft, this brother and these sisters of yours are the full brother and sisters of Mrs Vail? A. Oh, yes, one father and mother.

Q. Do you know, Mrs. Taft, whether your sister Mrs. Vail gave allowances to this brother and these sisters?

341 A. I know she gave one to Mrs. Ferris, whether she gave any to the others I do not know. I never had any idea that she had, but I think she made gifts from time to time.

Q. Do you know the financial condition of your sisters and brother? A. Yes.

Q. Will you please state that? A. I will begin with Mrs. Burdick. Mrs. Burdick is in the same position as I. She is a widow with no money of her own, no property of her own. She has four sons and they are only able to do moderately for her.

Q. Have they families of their own? A. Yes.

342 Q. How old is your sister, Mrs. Burdick? A. She is four and one-half years younger than I am.

Q. That would make it about 75? A. Yes.

Q. What is her physical condition, if you know? A. She is not well and strong, and I fear she is growing blind.

Q. So that she is unable to do any work? A. Oh, yes.

Q. The next sister? A. Mrs. Ferris. She is the widow of a missionary and is also in the very unfortunate position of being without any resources, and she has children, but her children are absolutely unable to do anything more than give her shelter. They cannot do anything in the way of money.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

343

Q. They can't clothe her? A. No.

Q. She is the one to whom Mrs. Vail made a gift annually? A. Yes.

Q. What is her physical condition, if you know? A. Well, not as good as mine. I am the oldest living.

Q. How old is Mrs. Ferris? A. She will be seventy-three in February.

Q. Please state the financial condition of your other sister, Mrs. Ferrin. A. So far as I know she is in very poor condition financially. Just what her husband left her I have never quite known.

344

Q. She is a widow. A. Yes she is a widow. Her husband died nearly three years ago and she is in such ill health that she has to have two nurses, a night nurse and a day nurse and she has used up all the property she had to pay for the expenses of this illness she has.

Q. Does she own her own home? A. Do you call it owning it when there is a mortgage on it.

Q. She has a home? A. Yes.

Q. And that has a mortgage on it. A. Yes.

Q. How much? A. It is a heavy mortgage.

Q. Do you know the amount? A. The mortgage I think at first was $13,000 but last year as some of her property didn't bring her anything and she had no other income she had to increase the mortgage.

345

Q. She had to borrow money to live on? A. Yes.

Q. And she borrowed by increasing the mortgage on her house? A. Yes.

Q. To get the money to support herself. A. Yes.

Mr. Montgomery: I now offer in evidence a letter from Lucy H. Ferris addressed to Mrs. Plumb which states the amounts of the allowances Mrs. Vail had been accustomed to give to Mrs. Ferris up to 1926.

346 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Q. Mrs. Taft, will you please look at the signature and tell me if that is Mrs. Ferris' signature? A. Yes, that is her signature.

Mr. Montgomery: I offer it in evidence.

Letter received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "3".

The letter—Plaintiff's Exhibit "3" reads as
347 follows:

"210 Farrand Park Avenue,
Highland Park, Michigan
November 9th, 1926.

My very dear MaBelle:

Your dear letter of the 4th came to me yesterday afternoon and last evening I looked up my old account books and found the figures which I knew I had kept.

I always keep an account of my daily expenditures, though small they may be and also all receipts of any kind, so I can turn at once to find
348 just such figures as you ask me to send to you.

In some instances I see that I did not note the date of receipt of a check from your mother but I have the months all right.

She was always, for some reason most generous to me and sent me additional gifts for some special expense but the annual gift or allowance never failed to come and could be depended upon.

After I came home from India and had resigned and with it lost my salary as a missionary, she of her loving accord said to me one day that as I was staying in this country, she should make me an annual gift, first it was some three hundred a year

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

paid in two or three installments and then later she said she would make just one gift in the fall of the year and so I give you the requested figures, as you ask for the past ten years. 349

In one of my many moves, I had a grand burning up of some old India account books and all of my accounts before 1914 unfortunately fell among the burned books.

1915—Apr.	.....	$200.00
Oct.	.....	300.00
Dec.	.....	300.00
1916—Apr.	.....	$200.00
June	.....	55.00
Oct.	.....	500.00
1917—Nov. 4th	.....	500.00
1918—Dec. 10th	.....	500.00
1919—Oct.	.....	500.00
1920—Oct.	.....	500.00
1921—Oct. 30th	.....	500.00
1922—Apr.	.....	$250.00
Nov. 4th	.....	500.00
1923—Oct. 1st	.....	500.00
1924—Apr.	.....	25.00
Oct. 4th	.....	500.00
1925—Nov. 16th	.....	500.00

350

351

All of these years I have felt most deeply affected by her generous gifts and several times I do not know what I could have done if it had not been for these gifts. Doctors, hospital and travel have taken so much of this money, that I have should have been desperate if it had not been for your mother's gifts to me. One thing she often said to me, that 'Lou, dear, you are the only one of the family who has never asked me for a cent'. That

352 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

is true for I never did say a thing to her about giving me a bit of any thing, except her love.

I do thank you from the bottom of my heart for your efforts to have the allowance continued to me and especially to sister Mary.

Always with dear love, I am as ever your Aunt

LUCY H. FERRIS

Please pardon this short first sheet. I find I had a bad error and so removed the portion."

353 Mr. Montgomery: I now offer in evidence a letter written by Abbe Ferrin Skinner to Mrs. Plumb dated November 29th. Will you please state who Mrs. Abbe Ferrin Skinner is, Mrs. Taft?

A. She is the daughter of Mrs. Ferrin, the only living child.

Q. Is Mrs. Ferrin's husband alive? A. No.

Q. When did he die? A. He died I think three years ago this February.

Q. Will you look at the signature of Abbe Ferrin Skinner and state if that is the signature of your niece? A.
354 Yes, that's my niece's signature.

Mr. Montgomery: I offer that in evidence.

Letter received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "4".

The letter—Petitioner's Exhibit "4" reads as follows:

"Six hundred sixteen Wolfs Lane
Pelham Manor
New York

Plaintiff's Exhibit 44.

355

Nov. 29th

Dear MaBelle—

Your letter to Mother, will have to be answered by me, for as you know she is very ill. During the past ten years she remembers just one real gift of stock worth $5000. (She had received a diamond and sapphire ring some time previously, worth perhaps $1000 not to speak of many other gifts such as ermine furs etc.)

Of course during the latter years of Father's life, Mother didn't feel the need of any assistance. 356
But now that Father is gone, and Mother has been ill for a year and a half, with doctors and nurses care all the time, she has felt the need for money. So much so that she recently wrote and asked Aunt Helen to borrow some money. She refused to do this in her present abnormal state of mind. Of course Mother feels that if Aunt Helen's mind had been functioning properly she would have helped her, and that what she has done in the past ten years is not a criterion of what she would do if normal. Just as she can not see *your* need, she has not seen the need of any of her brothers or 357
sisters. None of them would want to even suggest any help from her, if they didn't feel as I do, that any such help would not interfere with her spending all she could possibly desire on herself.

Father always felt so keenly the fact of your Aunt Mary's almost living on nothing for so many years—scrimping and mending, and going away downtown to business at 70 years of age every single day till uncle Harry died. Father and Uncle Ned and Aunt Emily had to make a much felt hole in their pockets to fill the role that Aunt Helen could

358 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

have filled so easily without the *least* bit of sacrifice. Aunt Helen has had no sense of how most of us live at all for many years. She couldn't seem to conceive how cramped many of us are. She always felt we were quite well off.

You are the first one who should receive some help. It is a crime for you to not have some money to use from your dear Father's savings, who would not have wanted you to suffer from need when he had left that fortune in the bank.

359 How cruelly the laws do work!

Sincerely,

ABBE FERRIN SKINNER."

Mr. Montgomery: I offer in evidence a letter signed "Aunt Elizabeth" addressed to Mrs. Plumb dated November 5th, 1926. Will you please state who Aunt Elizabeth is.

A. That is my sister, Mrs. Burdick.

Q. Will you please look at the signature and the whole letter and see if it is in the handwriting of your sister?

360 A. Yes, that's her writing.

Mr. Montgomery: I offer that in evidence, it shows the allowances made by Mrs. Vail to Mrs. Burdick.

Letter received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "5".

The Letter—Petitioner's Exhibit "5" reads as follows:

"Mrs. E. H. Burdick
Reed House

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

361

537 West 121st Street
New York, N. Y.

November 5, 1926.

My dear MaBelle.

It is wonderfully fine of you to try to secure from your Mother's estate some assistance for your various aunts and uncle. Until very recently your mother contributed annually five hundred dollars to my income and occasionally sent me a check for two, four or five hundred dollars in emergencies.

362

It would give me immense pleasure to have any amount given to me and I certainly hope you will be successful in your efforts to put through your generous impulse.

I am glad to know you received both Harry's and Reginald's letters. They both mentioned to me that they had written to you. But not receiving any acknowledgement they feared their letters had miscarried.

All my sons carry the happiest remembrances of their visits to Corning and Geneva and have a large heart of love for you and sympathy for the ordeal you are going through.

363

You know my Reginald carries the Houghton name and his eldest son is named after him.—Reginald Houghton Junior—so we have ever before us a suggestion of your dear father and mother.

Reginald Houghton Junior is a great splendid boy of seventeen fine looking and good.

Thank you dear MaBelle for your interest in my behalf.

Your very affectionate

AUNT ELIZABETH."

364 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Mr. Montgomery: I offer in evidence a letter signed "Edith" addressed to Mrs. Plumb. I might say that all these letters are not addressed to Mrs. Plumb, but to "MaBelle". Will you tell me, Mrs. Taft, who "MaBelle" is?

A. That is Mrs. Plumb.

Q. This letter is dated September 24th, Will you please tell me who "Edith" is? A. She is Mrs. William Twells Tiers.

365 Q. What relationship was Mrs. Tiers to your sister, Mrs. Vail? A. She is a niece—a daughter of our oldest sister who is dead.

Mr. Montgomery: We are not applying for an allowance for Mrs. Tiers, but the letter is introduced as corroborative evidence as to the necessity of an allowance to the brother and sisters of Mrs. Vail.

Letter received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "6".

366 The letter—Petitioner's Exhibit "6" reads as follows:

"631 Esplanade,
September 24th.

Dearest Ma Belle,

How wonderful you are, and how thoughtful of everyone in writing news of your Mother to the family. Your letter came in this mornings mail, and covered everything so thoroughly that I am sure the ones to whom it was sent will deeply appreciate, as I do, being told about your decisions for poor Aunt Helen. It is all unspeakably pitiful.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

367

But is at least a relief for you to know that she can afford everything to make her comfortable.

It was delightful to have the talk with you on the telephone and so beautiful of you dear girl, to make the effort so generously to help the family financially. It will be a real Godsend to each one, and to me to be relieved of this terrible anxiety.

The dates of the births of the family are as follows.

Mary Hall Taft, August 2, 1847
Elizabeth Hall Burdick, February 18, 1852 368
Lucy Hall Ferris, February 21, 1854
Edward Hagaman Hall, November 3, 1858
Abbe Hall Ferrin, September 30, 1860.

I think in my haste to get off the night letter to you, that I did not state the ages correctly of Aunt Elizabeth and Uncle Ned. As telegrams sometimes make mistakes in words and figures, I will mention that Aunt Elizabeth's address is 537 West 121st Street. She has a very tiny room in the apartment of a woman who leases rooms. She has to go out for her meals, and I do not know how she will ever manage if he is ill, but as the Burdick 369 sons are able to advise her, I am not letting myself try to settle her problem of living. The sons give her an allowance, as much as they can afford, but she has to be very frugal, and is worried about her future with her failing eyesight. She has cataracts which are not at present operable. She fears blindness and before long the need of an attendant. (the following sentence appears in ink on the margin of the first page of the letter and evidently refers to this portion of the letter) I did not know my poor Aunt's eyes were in such a serious condition.

370 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

The matter of combining all the sisters under one roof has been talked of for a long time, when Mother was living, and Uncle Charlie Ferrin was alive, we had conferences by the hour, and all sorts of schemes were discussed. The Ferrins offered Aunt Mary a home if she would put Grace in an asylum. As there was not money enough available to pay for a private institution permanently—we did finance a stay at Bloomingdale for a while for observation—it meant a State Asylum for Grace,
371 and the authorities at Bloomingdale expressed the opinion that she was not insane enough to require confinement, and that an institution like the State Asylums would make her thoroughly insane. Aunt Mary felt she could not endure the humiliation of it, and a few years ago when she was quite ill, she wrote a plea to Mother and Uncle Charlie to promise that in case of her death, Grace should not be put in a State asylum.

The combination of sisters seemed unfeasable, as neither Aunt Lucy nor Aunt Elizabeth felt they could stand Grace, and as far as expenses went,
372 Aunt Lucy could live more cheaply by dividing her time among her children, though it means a slave's life, as they seem to use her as a servant to cook and wash and clean. Aunt Elizabeth's room and food would be about the same as she is now living, as it would to pay her share in a combination, and she is more independent. Uncle Ned cannot ask any of the sisters to live with him as Bert is not judged permanently insane, and he feels that he must keep a home ready for her whenever she is well enough to occupy it, and she gets very much excited and wrought up if he even asks a sister to stay with him while she is away, as having her

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

home invaded, and her place usurped. Aunt Elizabeth cannot cook and is not strong enough to do housework, even if Ned did invite her to live with him, supposing that Bert should be willing. Bert has an impoverished sister to whom Ned gives the same amount he gives Aunt Mary. After his living expenses are paid he has been in the habit of dividing what was left between his sister and hers. The amount to be so divided depends on what his expenses have been. With Bert in Bloomingdale, there is very little left, and I am not sure there will be any at the end of this year. He makes the distribution December 31st. I believe he divides it in thirds, and gives one third to Bert for trips to see Edwina and to get clothes. But he denies himself pitifully to achieve this surplus.

About three years ago, when Uncle Charlie Ferrin dropped out of the combination, and I saw how mother's money was vanishing, I suggested to Aunt Mary that she apply for a place in St. Luke's Episcopal Home, and try to have Grace go as assistant Housekeeper or in some capacity to pay her board, but the application was refused as the Board decided that she had a sister who could support her, Aunt Helen's gifts having been known, and her general affluence. To be admitted, it must be proved that the applicant has no relatives who can make any sort of provision whatever, for her maintenance.

I feel that Aunt Mary is living at a minimum, and I am sure that no boarding place would be willing to accept Grace. She is able to get substitute jobs, but only brief ones, for there are too many capable young women, who are not *off* in the upper story. Grace is quite good at housework

376 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

and between them they get along with the most comfort for their money, and really the only way, with Graces peculiarities, is for them to have their own isolated little place.

They have been clothing themselves entirely on things sent by you, Laura and Aunt Helen—Abbe Frances and my clothes are so much worn when we are ready to discard them that they are not much use. So that while Aunt Mary has not had as much as $2500. and has made out, it is because
377 she has had gifts of clothes which she will not now receive, and in making a petition to the Court, it can be shown that owing to the deaths of various members of the family who contributed to the support of Aunt Helen's sisters, the burden would now have fallen on Aunt Helen alone, and under normal conditions she would have felt she must assume it, and certainly would have, since they have absolutely no other person to turn to.

I do hope my dear, though it is none of my business, that you will manage to petition for a proper allowance for yourself. Your Father never in-
378 tended you to be as hampered as you have been, and since your Mother will have everything that she requires, and may live for many years with the good care she is now having, you ought to be able to have what has been your due for years past. You are so extremely punctilious, that I fear you may not do yourself justice in the wish to not seem to be taking advantage of your Mother's state. So as your eldest cousin, do let me urge you to be just to your precious self and to what your Father would have wished for you.

Will you let me know what I shall do with the furniture, and do you want all four pieces—bed,

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

379

bureau, chest of drawers, and small washstand which can be used as a dressing table? You must understand that they are a gift to you. Long ago both Aunt Helen and Laura offered to buy them, and if there was any way for Aunt Helen to buy them now for you, the money would be most convenient, but I am not willing to accept anything from you, and I am glad to feel they will be in the family. Abbe Frances has no space for them, and I would hate to have them sold to probably some awful Jew.

380

I have not had a chance to speak to Abbe Frances about the clothes, but I think they would be most acceptable in the present state of their finances. She can put a little color on them if she does not wish to wear all black. If you are clearing out any of your Mother's things, I know Aunt Mary and Grace can use them. If she has a superfluous evening wrap, I could use one.

I am glad that you have George, for you will know everything is being carefully safeguarded. And I hope that you will now have a little respite from anxiety and have good health and an easy mind to enjoy these coming years. They are the 381 best, the forties and fifties. One has youth enough to still enjoy adventure, and experience enough to know what to choose for the greatest satisfaction. If the law of averages holds, surely you have great brightness ahead.

May God give you all that you so richly deserve, dear girl. With a heartful of love to all three of you,

Devotedly yours,

EDITH."

Mr. Montgomery: That is all.

382 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

By Mr. Egan:

Q. What was the date of your husband's death? A. November 1, 1904

Q. So that the allowances have been made to you since that date? A. Yes.

That is all.

Mr. King: No further questions.

383 MARY HALL TAFT

Sworn to before me this
23rd day of December, 1926.

PHILIP J. DUNN.
Referee.

DOCTOR EDWARD HAGAMAN HALL, witness called on behalf of the petitioner, having been first duly sworn by the Referee, testified as follows:

By Mr. Montgomery:—

384

Q. What is your full name? A. Dr. Edward Hagaman Hall.

Q. Will you please state your address? A. 154 Nassau Street, New York City.

Q. You are the Doctor Hall, a brother of Mrs. Vail to whom Mrs. Taft referred in her testimony? A. I am.

Q. Did you hear Mrs. Taft's testimony? A. I did.

Q. With respect to the number of the brothers and sisters of Mrs. Vail? A. Yes, sir.

Q. That testimony was correct. A. That is correct.

Q. You heard the testimony of Mrs. Taft with respect

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

385

to the physical and financial condition of the sisters of Mrs. Vail now living? A. Yes.

Q. And that was correct? A. That was correct, sir.

Q. Mr. Hall, did Mrs. Vail prior to the time she was committed, give you an allowance? A. She gave me gifts at various times.

Q. Can you state what those gifts were? A. Subsequent to 1900 she gave me an aggregate of a little over $6250.

Q. Were those gifts made pretty regular each year? A. No, sir, at odd intervals.

386

Q. When did those gifts cease, Mr. Hall? A. The last gift was given me in 1918.

Q. Will you please state your age, Dr. Hall? A. Sixty-eight.

Q. Will you please state what your financial condition is? A. I am self-supporting. My income is derived mainly from my salary as secretary of two civic organizations, the Association for the Protection of the Adirondacks and American Scenic & Historic Preservation Society. I am married. I have had a good deal of illness in my family during the past fifteen years, and during the past three years and the past year over half of my income has been devoted to doctors and hospitals. By 387 economies and some personal self denials and going without recreation, I have been able to make both ends meet and have a few hundred dollars to give my sister.

Q. Would you mind stating what your salary is? A. The aggregate salary from these two organizations is $5700 a year.

Q. Out of that salary you have been assisting your sisters? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Contributing to their support? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And these sisters, you know, have no property and no income of their own? A. No, sir, not any.

388 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Q. Except Mrs. Ferrin who owns the house in which she lives? A. That's right.

Q. But she had to increase the mortgage to make her ends meet? A. Yes, sir. Might I add in the record in regard to Mrs. Ferrin, something which Mrs. Taft did not. She is confined to her bed. She is bed-ridden. She cannot leave her room and has a nurse day and night.

Q. Do you know Mrs. Taft's daughter? A. I do.

Q. Do you know her physical condition? A. Yes, sir. Her bodily condition is fairly good, but her mental con-
389 dition is not.

Q. So that you know that Mrs. Taft's statement as to her inability to obtain and keep employment is true? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mrs. Taft has to take care of her? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And support her? A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Montgomery: That is all.

By Mr. King:

Q. Mr. Hall, have you any independent income other than that you have testified to? A. I have a little income
390 from savings I put aside in lieu of life insurance, but that is all.

Q. And that amounts to what? A. That would amount to fifteen hundred or two thousand a year.

Q. In addition to the $5700 you have testified to? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you own your own home? A. No. I live in an apartment.

Referee: Can you give an outline of your family history:

Witness: Our father was Judge Hall. We were born in Auburn, New York, and our father was

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

Chief Justice of Colorado; he was made the first Chief Justice of Colorado during the Civil War by President Lincoln's appointment. He left us no means. My oldest sister and most of us had to be self-supporting. 391

Referee: Did he give everyone of you an education?

Witness: We only had a common school education and a high school education, but we have added to our culture by application. We have been lecturers and teachers and for my own part I am associated with the Cathedral of Saint John the Divine and with Bishop Manning on the Building Committee, and trying to do my part for the public welfare. Our means have not been equal to our social position, if you wish me to say that. 392

Mr. Montgomery: In other words, your means are not adequate to support you in the social position you are entitled to be supported in?

Witness: No, sir.

Referee: And that applies to your sisters also does it not?

Witness: Yes.

That is all. 393

EDWARD HAGAMAN HALL.

Sworn to before me this
23rd day of December, 1926.

PHILIP J. DUNN.
Referee.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

394 MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the Petitioner called in her own behalf, having been first duly sworn by the Referee, testified as follows:

By Mr. Montgomery:—

Q. Please state your full name? A. MaBelle Houghton Plumb.

Q. What is your address, Mrs. Plumb? A. 411 Lancaster Pike, Haverford, Pennsylvania.

Q. Mrs. Plumb, are you the daughter of Mrs. Helen
395 Hall Vail, the incompetent in this proceeding? A. I am.

Q. Will you please state how many times Mrs. Vail has been married? A. Twice.

Q. Whom did she marry the first time? A. Charles Frederick Houghton, my father.

Q. Whom did she marry the second time? A. Charles Delamater Vail.

Q. When did Mr. Houghton die? A. My father died March 29, 1897.

Q. Did he leave a last will. A. He did.

Mr. Montgomery: I offer in evidence certified
396 copy of the Last Will and Testament of Charles F. Houghton, deceased, Will dated the 20th day of March, 1893 and probated on the 17th day of April, 1897 in the Surrogates Court of the County of Steuben, New York. After one or two bequests the testator left the residue of his estate to the Farmers Loan and Trust Company to be held by them in trust during the life of his widow, the net income to be paid to her. After her death he directed that the estate should be divided into two equal parts and the income applied to his daughter Laura one-half and the other half to his daughter MaBelle and

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

upon the death of said daughters, the share held in trust for each of them should vest in their issue, if any.

Received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "7".

Mr. Montgomery: Letters Testamentary were issued under said will to the Farmers Loan and Trust Company and I offer in evidence a certificate of the issuance of letters.

Received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "8".

Q. Mrs. Plumb, the daughter Laura mentioned in the will of your father is not now living is she? A. No, she is not.

Q. Did she marry during her lifetime? A. Yes

Q. Whom did she marry? A. Ieuan Harris.

Q. Did she leave any children? A. Three sons.

Q. Will you please give their names? A. John Houghton Harris, William Rees Harris and David Farnum Harris.

Q. And their father is who? A. Ieuan Harris.

Q. He is present here? A. Yes.

Q. MaBelle C. mentioned in the will is yourself? A. Yes.

Q. When were you married, Mrs. Plumb? A. June 22nd, 1912.

Q. And what is the name of your husband? A. Joseph Judson Plumb.

Q. Have you any children? A. One son.

Q. What is his name? A. Joseph Hudson Plumb, Jr.

Q. Did your mother have any other children besides

400 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

yourself and Mrs. Harris? A. One daughter, Florence, who died in infancy.

Q. You heard Mrs. Taft give the names and addresses of all of the living sisters and brothers of your mother, did you not? A. I did, yes.

Q. And that was correct? A. Yes.

Q. And you heard her testify as to their financial and physical conditions, did you not? A. I did.

Q. And that testimony was correct? A. Yes

Q. Do you know whether your mother has ever made a
401 will? A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Have you asked any of the attorneys who ever represented her if they have ever drawn a will for her? A. Yes, I made all possible inquiries and I found no will. By "all possible inquiries" I mean all the people she had any legal business with.

Q. And the only living child of your mother is yourself. A. Yes.

Q. And her only living grandchildren are the three boys whom you have just mentioned, the children of her deceased daughter, Mrs. Harris? A. And my son—four grandsons.

402 Q. Did your mother at any time give you an allowance, Mrs. Plumb? A. Yes, she has.

Q. Will you please state what that allowance was? A. I have a little memorandum here to refer to if I may.

Q. Surely, you can read from it if you like. A. In the year 1912 my mother gave me an allowance of $1500. In 1913 she gave me $3000. In 1914 she raised that to $6000 and has continued that up to the past year or so.

Q. Did she give you any other presents besides those. A. Yes, she gave me gifts at the time of my marriage which amounted to $5100. At the time of my boy's birth she gave me various gifts which amounted to about $1600.

Q. When did you marry? A. I was married in 1912.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

403

Q. And did your mother's gifts cease when you married? A. No.

Q. They continued? A. They increased after I was married.

Q. Will you please continue giving the various allowances? A. Then in the year 1914 she gave me gifts amounting to $6,000 in cash.

Q. Anything else in that year? A. And in the year 1917 she gave me a house and a cash gift of $5,000. $30,000 was paid for the house. And last year in February she gave me a check for $5,000. It was not my allowance—it was a gift. She did things a little irregularly for the last year or so. 404

Q. When did her allowances to you cease? A. About a year or a year and a half ago.

Q. About the time you commenced to feel she was not herself? A. Yes.

Q. Did your mother give equal allowances to your sister while she was alive? A. Yes, whenever she gave my sister a gift of any kind she always gave me the same and vice versa.

Q. When did your sister die Mrs. Plumb? A. Last year.

Q. What property do you personally own, Mrs. Plumb? 405
A. I don't own anything.

Q. And you have no income of your own? A. No, nothing, except about $300 a year from the Farmers Loan and Trust Company from a small estate my father left to one of his sisters and that was to be divided between my sister and myself.

Q. Where is your mother now staying? A. At Dr. Macdonald's House, a sanitarium at Central Valley, New York.

Q. Has she been committed to that institution do you know? A. Yes, she has.

406 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Q. Who placed your mother in the institution? A. I did.

Q. Did you make any arrangements with the institution for her care? A. Yes, I have a day nurse and a night nurse for her and I have arranged for her to have three rooms and a bath and that she shall have an automobile ride every afternoon that it is possible for her to go out.

Q. And have you arranged for medical attendance for her? A. Yes; the doctor there, Dr. Pilgrim sees her every day. Sometimes two and three times a day, and he reports to me weekly on her condition.

407 Q. Do you know what the amount will be needed yearly to maintain your mother at the institution? A. I couldn't answer that question intelligently now because she has only been there a short time, but I think the Farmers Loan and Trust Company can give you that information.

Q. You directed the institution to send the bills for your mothers maintainence to the Farmers Loan and Trust Company? A. Yes. I think Mr. Marks can give you the information.

Mr. Montgomery: That is all.

Mr. King: In lieu of an examination of Mrs.
408 Plumb, I will ask Mrs. Plumb if she will make a concession on the record which I will read to her.

STIPULATION.

The petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, at the request of Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian for John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, minors, makes the following concession and stipulation upon the record of this proceeding.

1. That the petitioner's father, Charles F. Houghton, died on or about the 29th day of March, 1897, and was

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

survived by his widow, Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent, and by his daughters, Laura Houghton Harris and MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, his only next of kin. 409

2. That at the time of the death of the said Charles F. Houghton, the property and estate of Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent, was inconsequential in value or in amount except in so far as she benefited by the will of her said husband.

3. That at the time of the death of the said Charles F. Houghton, the petitioner and her sister, Laura Houghton Harris, were both minors, the former being of the age of 13 years and the latter 17 years; that both of them were then unmarried and resided with their mother, upon whom they were wholly dependent for support and maintenance. 410

4. That petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, continued to reside with her mother until her marriage to Joseph H. Plumb on or about the 22nd day of June, 1912, and her sister, Laura Houghton Harris, continued to reside with her mother until her marriage to Ieuan Harris on or about the 16th day of July, 1914. 411

5. That following the death of their father, Charles F. Houghton, and until their marriage, both the petitioner and her sister, Laura Houghton Harris, were wholly dependent upon their mother for maintenance and support.

6. That as issue of the marriage of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, there is but one child, Joseph H. Plumb, a minor, of the age of years, and as issue of the marriage of Laura Houghton Harris, there are three children, John H. Harris, a minor, aged 11 years, William R. Harris, a

412. *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

minor, aged 9 years, and David F. Harris, a minor, aged 6 years.

7. That irrespective of the marriage of either daughter and the circumstance that each of them thereby acquired the marital right or support by their respective husbands, and irrespective of any other circumstance, arising out of the marriage of either daughter, their mother, Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent, both before and after the marriages of her daughters, consistently mainifested a disposition and intention to benefit equally the petitioner and her sis-
413 ter, Laura Houghton Harris, and any gift of money or property to one was coincident with and characterized by a gift substantially similar in kind, value and amount to the other daughter.

8. That since the death of Laura Houghton Harris, the sister of the petitioner, which occurred on or about the 31st day of August, 1925, the said Helen Hall Vail, has made no substantial gifts to or has otherwise granted to or conferred upon the petitioner any money, property, benefit or thing of value.

The petitioner therefore consents and agrees, in the
414 event that she survives her mother and thereby becomes entitled to a share of the latter's estate, either by the will or intestacy of the said Helen Hall Vail, any such share shall be charged with any allowance which may be awarded to the petitioner in this proceeding to the extent, if any, by which such allowance exceeds in value or in amount, the aggregate of any allowance or allowances which may be awarded in this proceeding to the General Guardian of the said infants, John H. Harris, William R. Harris, and David F. Harris, minors, and

The petitioner further consents and agrees that any order, which may be made in this proceeding, awarding

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

415

an allowance to this petitioner, shall be conditioned in accordance with this stipulation and shall provide that any award thereunder shall be allowed to the petitioner only by way of advancement, and, as such, shall be accepted by the petitioner.

Mr. Montgomery: It is rather difficult for Mrs. Plumb to answer that and I would like to read the answer for her which she will adopt.

Mrs. Plumb is willing and agrees that the order granting the allowance shall contain a direction that if the amounts paid to her exceed the total amounts paid to the infants, that the excess shall be considered as an advancement provided that the order shall direct that if the total amount paid to the infants shall exceed the amount paid to her that the excess paid to the infants shall be considered also as an advancement. In other words, it shall work both ways. 416

Mr. King: I think that is entirely agreeable to the general guardian of these infants, and as a matter of fact, to the attorneys, but as I understand it, the general guardian cannot stipulate and that is the reason I am unwilling to enter into such a stipulation. 417

Mr. Montgomery: I think that what I read should be amended to this extent: "Any amounts paid to the infants or the general guardian on their behalf".

No examination of Mrs. Plumb by Mr. Egan.

Referee: (To Mrs. Plumb) You approve of this application, do you not?

418 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Witness: Yes, I do.

Mr. Montgomery: When did Mr. Vail die, Mrs. Plumb?

Witness: About 1922.

Mr. Montgomery: So that your mother is a widow again?

Witness: Yes.

Referee: I understand you to say that you approve of this application?

Witness: Yes I do.

419 Referee: You understand what the proceeding is all about.

Witness: I do, Mr. Dunn, yes, and I think that the whole thing seems just right to me.

Mr. King: Mrs. Plumb, in the course of your testimony you referred to income you received from a little estate which was provided for in your father's will for one of your aunts.

Witness: Yes.

Mr. King: I think I understand that the life interest of your aunt has fallen in by her death.

Witness: Yes.

420 Mr. King: Will you look at paragraph "FOURTH" in your father's will which has been put in evidence and tell me if that is the source of the income to which you have referred?

Witness: Yes, that's it.

Mr. Montgomery: And the three grandchildren —the children of your sister Mrs. Harris also receive one-half of that income? Is that correct?

Witness: Yes, it is divided among them.

Referee: Is your boy going to school now?

Witness: Yes, he is going to school.

Referee: Where is he going to school?

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

421

Witness: He is going to Montgomery Day School near us in one of the suburbs of Philadelphia, and I hope to be able to send him to boarding school next year.

Referee: And if you get an allowance in these proceedings it will enable you to give him a better education.

Witness: Yes, we will be able to give him a good many advantages, because we will have more means.

Mr. Montgomery: And you cannot give him those advantages unless you do get the allowance? 422

Witness: No, we wouldn't be able to.

That is all.

MaBelle Houghton Plumb.

Sworn to before me this
23rd day of December, 1926.

Philip J. Dunn
Referee.

Mr. Montgomery: I offer in evidence Notice of this hearing with proof of due service on all parties. 423

Received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "9".

Mr. Montgomery: I offer in evidence copy of the Petition in this proceeding, the original of which is on file in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York.

Received in evidence and marked Petitioner's Exhibit "10".

424 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Mr. Egan: I offer in evidence the Answer and Cross Petition of the Farmers Loan and Trust Company as Committee of Helen Hall Vail praying for instructions of the court in this matter.

Received in evidence and marked Committee's Exhibit "A".

Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of the infants John
425 Houghton Harris, William Rees Harris and David Farnum Harris, having been first duly sworn by the referee, testified as follows:

By Mr. King:

Q. Where do you reside, Mr. Harris? A. Geneva, N. Y.

Q. Has that been your home for some time? A. Yes.

Q. You are the husband of Laura Houghton Harris who has been mentioned in this proceeding? A. Yes.

Q. She is now dead? A. Yes.

Q. What is the date of your marriage? A. July 16th,
426 1914.

Q. What was the date of your wife's death? A. August 31st, 1925.

Q. And during your married life did you live at Geneva, New York. A. Most of the time.

Q. Are there any children of the marriage? A Three boys.

Q. And those three boys are the infants in this proceeding? A. Yes.

Q. Will you please state their names and their ages? A. John Houghton, eleven, William Rees, nine David Farnum, six.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

427

Q. During your married life, did Mrs. Vail also live at Geneva, New York? A. Yes.

Q. And she was your neighbor there? A. Yes.

Q. At all times during your married life, were your means of such a character that you were able to provide for the education, support and maintenance of your family? A. Yes.

Q. And at the present time? A. Yes.

Q. And at no time were you ever dependent upon Mrs. Vail for support? A. No.

Q. Following the death of Laura Houghton Harris, 428
were you appointed guardian of these children? A. I was.

Mr. King: I offer in evidence exemplification of the record of the Surrogate's Court of Ontario County appointing Mr. Harris guardian of his three minor children who are named as infant parties to this proceeding.

Received in evidence and marked General Guardian's Exhibit "I".

Q. Upon the death of Mrs. Harris, did she leave a will? A. Yes. 429

Q. I refer to Laura Houghton Harris? A. Yes.

Q. Are you executor of that will? A. Yes.

Q. And that will provides, does it not, that you are the sole beneficiary? A. Yes.

Mr. King: I offer in evidence exemplification of the record upon the probate of the will of Laura Houghton Harris in the Surrogates Court of Ontario County. The only reason why I offer this will in evidence is because of any presumption that possibly Laura Houghton Harris died intestate

430 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 1½.*

and that these children thereby acquired some interest in her estate.

Received in evidence and marked General Guardian's Exhibit "II".

Q. Following the probate of the will of Laura Houghton Harris, was her estate appraised? A. Yes.

Mr. King: I offer in evidence certified copy of
431 the order appraising the estate of Laura Houghton Harris dated March 2nd, 1926. It appears from this appraisal that the value of the estate was $50,696.25.

Received in evidence and marked General Guardian's Exhibit "III".

Q. Included in that estate was there any real estate? A. Yes.

Q. Is that real estate the home in Geneva which you occupy and which is known as "Fairfield"? A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember the appraised value of that real
432 estate? A. $30,000.

Q. Did that home ever belong to Mrs. Vail? A. Yes.

Q. And was it given by her to her daughter Laura? A. Yes.

Referee: Was it given about the same time that she gave Mrs. Plumb the house valued at $30,000?

Witness: I think roughly it was about 1916 or 1917.

Mrs. Plumb: She gave me mine in 1917.

Referee: They were both of the same value?

Witness: Roughly about the same value, yes.

Referee: In other words, she tried to give to both daughters equally?

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

433

Witness: Yes.

Q. While Mrs. Vail resided in Geneva was she a frequent visitor at your home? A. Yes.

Q. She was familiar with your circumstances and the manner in which you lived? A. Yes.

Q. Did she make an allowance to her daughter? A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall whether or not she made them at periodical intervals? A. Yes, as a rule. Until latterly, we couldn't depend upon the date exactly.

434

Q. Have you any knowledge of what those amounted to? A. At first it was $5000. a year and she increased it to $6000.

Q. And it has always been her practice to make a corresponding allowance to her other daughter, Mrs. Plumb? A. Yes.

That is all.

Referee: Are your boys going to school?

Witness: The two older ones. The youngest one is at home—he is only six years old.

Referee: What school do they go to?

Witness: Repton School, at Tarrytown, New York.

435

By Mr. King:

Q. Mr. Harris, the value of your bond as guardian as appears from the exemplification of the guardianship record which has been put in evidence, fixes the value of your children's property at $2500. each? A. That's right.

Q. Do you know how that was arrived at? A. That comes from a trust fund set up by Mr. Houghton in favor of his sister Catherine S. Houghton and upon her death was to be divided among Mr. Houghton's two daughters.

436 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Q. Your children have succeeded to the share of their mother? A. Yes, $7500, all told.

Q. And this trust fund that you refer to is the same trust fund that I asked Mrs. Plumb about? A. Yes.

Q. So that each child has $2500. A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has that money ever been received from the Farmer's Loan and Trust Company? A. No.

Q. Aside from these moneys, have your children any other property of their own for which you are guardian? A. No.

437 Q. Or for which anyone else is guardian? A. No.

Q. Have they an interest in any other estate or in the estate of their grandfather, Charles F. Houghton. A. Only after the death of their grandmother, Mrs. Vail.

Q. That is the only estate? A. Yes.

Q. You provide for all their needs? A. Yes.

Q. And except as you have testified, they have no other property. A. No.

That is all.

IEFAN HARRIS.

Sworn to before me this
7th day of December, 1927.

438 PHILIP J. DUNN
Referee.

ALEX D. MARKS, witness called on behalf of the Petitioner, having been first duly sworn by the Referee testified as follows:

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. What is your occupation? A. I am an employee of the Farmers Loan and Trust Company. I am a member of the Trust Department.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

439

Q. The Farmers Loan and Trust Company being the Trustee under the will of Mr. Houghton, deceased? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Marks, will you please state what the annual income has been upon the trust created for the benefit of Mrs. Helen Hall Vail since 1923, the gross income by the year? A. The gross income payable to Mrs. Vail during the year 1923 amounted to the sum of $240,209.22, and for 1924, $252,395.27, and for 1925 $308,732.20, and for the year 1926 up to the close of business as of the 9th of December, 1926—$651,692.82.

440

Q. Mr. Marks, will you please state, if you can, the amount of accumulated income received from the estate of Charles F. Houghton payable to Mrs. Helen Hall Vail on hand at this time? A. $812,445.57.

Q. Can you state what it was on August 3rd, 1926 about the date when Mrs. Vail was declared to be incompetent to manage her own affairs? A. $757,214.25.

Q. So that from August 3rd, 1926 to December 9th, 1926, the accumulated income has increased by what figure? A. $55,231.32.

Q. From August 3rd, 1926 to December 9th, 1926? A. Yes.

441

Q. That is, after making all payments? A. Yes, after making all payments for expenses for Mrs. Vail and other expenses of administration.

Q. What were those expenses? A. In the first place, the expenses of having the Trust Company appointed Committee of her property, fees paid to the doctors in that connection and to the lawyers, and the expenses of maintaining Mrs. Vail at Dr. MacDonald's House at Central Valley, New York.

Q. Can you state what the expenses of maintaining Mrs. Vail at that institution have amounted to? A. We paid three bills to date, but it has just gotten started.

442 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

On November 8th we paid the sum of $1040.69, and on December 1st we paid $1165.64, and for half the month of September $463.47.

Q. That was all paid to Dr. MacDonald's House at Central Valley? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you testify when Mrs. Vail went to that institution? A. September 16th, 1926.

Q. And the cost of maintaining Mrs. Vail at Dr. MacDonald's home would amount to about how much per month? A. You mean the actual expenses at Dr. Mac-
443 Donald's House?

Q. Yes? A. Certainly as much as $1200 a month. Possibly a good deal more. I don't know exactly.

Referee: Why do you say "possibly a good deal more"?

Witness: I suppose she might be sick which will incur further expenses; perhaps an occasional $100 for doctor's bills. It might be $1500 a month.

Q. But you feel sure it will never exceed $2000 a month, don't you? A. Yes, I do.

Q. Are there any other expenses which you have in-
444 curred since your appointment as Committee of the property of Mrs. Vail outside of legal expenses, etc. necessary for the proceeding to have Mrs. Vail declared an incompetent, and the expenses at Dr. MacDonald's Sanitarium? A. There haven't been very many. There are several things purchased for Mrs. Vail of a minor nature. Flowers have been sent to her by Mrs. Plumb. There are several bills of that kind to be paid.

Q. I just mean any expenses you have been put to aside from those I just mentioned? A. We had to have the real estate and personal effects appraised. We have been paying taxes on the property—on the real estate.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

445

Q. How much are the taxes on the real estate? A. I am not in a position to state just what the amount of the taxes is? We don't know the exact amount. I could find out by telephoning—by calling up our real estate department. I don't think that they have paid yet. I think I saw one tax bill—something like $1200. that went through the ledger on one of the properties.

Q. Do you know what property Mrs. Vail owns outside of this accumulated income? A. She has a big house at Geneva, New York, and a very much smaller place at Spring Lake, New Jersey. She has a home at Palm Beach, Florida, with personal effects in all these houses.

446

Q. You are not in a position now to state just what it costs to maintain those per year? A. No, I am not. I do not know how much it will cost. I cannot state just how much it will cost to maintain them a year. We haven't spent much on them to date. We don't know how much it will cost to maintain them a year.

Q. Would it exceed $5000. a year? A. Why, I don't believe we can predict that in advance due to the condition of the property at Palm Beach. It would be hard to say how much. I think it will be a very small ratio to the amount of the total income which Mrs. Vail has.

447

Referee: Do you know the appraised values of these properties?

Witness: Yes, I can give you those: The property at Geneva, New York was appraised for $140,577.65; consisting of land, $20,500; buildings and building fixtures, $66,075.90; furnishings and fixtures, $54,001.75. The property at Spring Lake, New Jersey is appraised at $50,953.30, consisting of land, $21,500, building and building fixtures, $23,757.30, furnishing and fixtures, $5,696. Property at Palm Beach, Florida was appraised at

448 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

$433,862.83 consisting of land, $351,400.; buildings and building fixtures, $66,772.93; furnishings and fixtures, $15,689.90. The appraisal was made by the American Appraisal Company.

Q. Are those properties bringing in any income? A. They are bringing in no income.

Referee: Any mortgages on them?

Witness: No, sir.

449 Mr. Egan: What is the date of the appraisal?

Witness: I haven't got it. We just had these appraised about the 1st of October.

Q. Mr. Marks at this date you are not able to accurately state how much it is going to cost to maintain Mrs. Vail at the institution? A. Well, looking at these figures here, it would look as if it would cost about thirteen or fourteen thousand a year. Of course I cannot predict that definitely. It might cost more, but from the bills of Dr. Macdonald's House it would appear—

Q. You have no reason to believe that they may be larger? A. No.

450

Referee: What about the jewelry.

Witness: We have some jewelry.

Referee: What is the appraised value of the jewelry—what does it consist of?

Witness: $177,418.

Referee: Probably you can tell us what the principal of that trust is from which she derives that income. What does that amount to?

Witness: Why I couldn't tell you the exact value of the principal of the trust for the reason that it mostly consists of the stock of the Corning Glass

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

Works. We are not in a position to state the exact value of that stock. The estate owns some real estate in Duluth of a relatively small amount, and some securities of a relatively small amount compared with the stock of the Corning Glass Works, which is very valuable. It is very closely held and we don't know anybody that is in a position to state exactly what it is worth. 451

Referee: Didn't you ever figure out how much the gross was worth.

Witness: Not the Corning Glass Works stock. Everything but the Corning Glass Works stock. The market value of the securities held as trustee under the will of Charles F. Houghton, which were appraised as of last August, was $617,148.13, but that doesn't include the Corning Glass Works stock. 452

Referee: Outside of that they had $617,148.13 worth of securities?

Witness: Yes.

Referee: And you have no idea what the Corning Glass Works stock is worth.

Witness: I think it is worth a good deal of money. I cannot tell you exactly what it is worth.

Referee: You mean to say there is a very large income coming in all the time from Corning Glass Works stock? 453

Witness: Yes.

Referee: Was there never an appraisal made of that stock?

Witness: Not so far as I know. Of course I suppose it must have been appraised in the transfer tax proceedings when Charles F. Houghton died back in 1897.

Referee: But it has changed since then?

Witness: Yes.

454 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Q. The stock is held privately and nobody will sell it, isn't that it? A. There is hardly any market for the stock that is true. Hardly anybody wants to sell it.

Q. It is so valuable? A. Yes.

Mr. Egan: The income doesn't represent any stated percentage on the investment—say 5% or 6%?

Witness: No, on account of extra dividends. This last year there have been over five hundred
455 thousand dollars in dividends.

Referee: Has the common stock of that company any par value?

Witness: No par value.

Referee: How many shares of stock are there in the estate?

Witness: 40,320. of common stock of the Corning Glass Works.

Referee: Any preferred stock?

Witness: Yes, sir.

Referee: How many shares?

Witness: 5040.

456 Q. What is the par value of the preferred stock? A. $100 par.

Q. Have you searched for any will of Mrs. Vail? A. Yes, I have.

Q. What have you done? A. I went through and had others go through all the records of the Farmers Loan and Trust Company having reference to wills and we have no record of any will for Mrs. Vail. We have no copy of any will of Mrs. Vail. I also called on our attorneys, Geller, Ralston & Blanc and Mr. Capron of that firm consulted his records and he stated that they have no record of ever having drawn a will for Mrs. Vail.

457

Q. Were they attorneys for Mrs. Vail as far as you know? A. I don't know.

Q. They were the attorneys for the estate of Charles F. Houghton? A. Yes. I Understand that Mrs. Vail consulted them. I simply went there knowing that many of our clients go to our attorneys to have wills drawn.

By Mr. King:

Q. After the Farmers Loan and Trust Company was appointed Committee, did it take an inventory of the Committee's property—of Mrs. Vail's property? A. Yes. 458
We had the American Appraisal Company appraise all the real estate and inventory all the personal effects at Geneva and at Palm Beach and Spring Lake, and then Mrs. Vail's jewelry was appraised by a firm here—Samuel Marx, Inc. I went up with one of their appraisers to Geneva and he appraised all the jewelry which she had there, then the property which was appraised was appraised by the American Appraisal Company.

Q. Have you that inventory with you? A. No, it is a big thing. I gave you the total values there.

Q. Did you put that on the record? A. Yes, Mr. Dunn asked me for it.

459

Q. At the time of the appointment of the Farmers Loan & Trust Company there was a large amount of accumulated income in the possession of the Farmers Loan & Trust Company as trustee which had not been paid over to Mrs. Vail? A. Yes.

Q. What did that amount to at that time? A. I have testified to that—$757,214.25.

Q. Then your testimony was that the net income had accumulated to the extent of about $50,000. within the last few months? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Aside from this income which was in the hands of the Farmers Loan & Trust Company, was there any

460 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

stock which belonged to Mrs. Vail which came to you from some other source? A. Not to amount to anything at all. There were a few stocks there of no value. I don't think there was anything worth anything. She had some bank balances in banks—a balance in Palm Beach and at Spring Lake—very small. That is all there was.

Q. Substantially all the property which she had at the time of the order adjudicating her an incompetent was in the hands of the committee? A. Yes. And the contents of the houses and a few odds and ends which we found—
461 they don't amount to anything at all. Some furs at C. C. Shayne & Co., some ivory and ivory sets at Black, Starr & Frost and some carpets at the Knickerbocker Cleaning Co.

Q. I am just interested in the securities? A. There were none, except those we found among her personal effects. They had some very small value. They were worth several thousand dollars.

Q. How many? A. Well, there were ten shares of Hawley Motor Company preferred valued at $100.00; 2½ shares of the Ontario Coal Company common stock valued at $172.50; ten shares preferred stock of the Ontario Coal Company, valued at $1210.—50 shares of the Thompson,
462 Holmes & Converse, preferred, worth $2500. There were several other securities which were valued by our statistical department as worthless.

Q. Are the arrangements for Mrs. Vail's care and comfort made by the Trust Company? A. Mrs. Plumb makes the arrangement for her care and comfort and the bills are sent to us and we pay them from Mrs. Vail's property in our hands.

That is all.

ALEXANDER D. MARKS.

Sworn to before me this
23rd day of December, 1926.

PHILIP J. DUNN

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

463

MRS. MABELLE H. PLUMB, recalled.

Mr. Montgomery:

Q. Did you, outside of asking the various people and attorneys, make a search among your mother's effects for a will? A. Yes, I did.

Q. And you found none? A. I found none.

Referee: You went through her home where she was living?

Witness: Yes, all three of her homes, because 464
until I was appointed guardian I had to take care of her belongings, and I asked three or four different lawyers with whom she did business, and asked the Farmers Loan & Trust Company, and followed up every avenue that I could think of.

Referee: Has she a safe deposit vault?

Witness: I don't think she had one. I understand from her man George, who has been a servant in her employ for a good many years that she wouldn't trust anything in the banks. He would know.

Referee: So far as you know she had no safe 465
deposit box?

Witness: George said there was no safe deposit box.

Referee: You found no keys or bills from safe deposit company among her papers?

Witness: No.

Q. Do you know who was formerly her attorney at Geneva? A. Latterly she would have one and then another. She wouldn't give her business to any one particular lawyer.

466 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

Q. Did you make inquiry of them? A. Yes. There were two of them.

Q. What are their names? A. L. Guy Hoskins and Mr. Smith O'Brien.

Mr. King: They are two leading lawyers in Geneva, are they not?

Witness: Yes.

Q. And they took care of the affairs of your mother?
467 A. They are the only ones that mother has employed there.

Q. You inquired of both of them? A. Yes.

Q. What did they say? A. That they know nothing of any will. I didn't do that myself; it was done for me. That is all.

MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB.

Sworn to before me this
23rd day of December, 1926.

PHILIP J. DUNN
Referee.

---

468 JOHN D. PEABODY, witness called on behalf of the Petitioner having been first duly sworn by the Referee, testified as follows:

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. Did you call upon any attorneys in New York to ascertain if they knew whether Mrs. Vail had made a will? A. I did.

Q. Will you please state who they were and what they said. A. I was advised by Mrs. Plumb that Mrs. Vail in the past had employed Mr. Charles E. Hughes, and I

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

called upon Mr. Hughes, Jr. and asked him whether he had any record of having made any will for Mrs. Vail and he said no. 469

Q. Did you call upon anybody else? A. No.

Q. Your firm never made a will for Mrs. Vail, did it? A. No.

JOHN D. PEABODY

Sworn to before me this
23rd day of December, 1926.

PHILIP J. DUNN
Referee. 470

FREDERICK P. KING, witness called on behalf of the Petitioner, having been first duly sworn by the Referee testified as follows:

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. Mr. King, did you know Mrs. Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent in this proceeding? A. Yes.

Q. How many years have you known her? A. I have known Mrs. Vail about 30 years.

Q. Did you ever draw a will for her? A. I never did. I might volunteer the information that sometime in the last few years there was a proceeding which was instituted by the Farmers Loan and Trust Company to construe the will of Charles F. Houghton, deceased, as to the authority of the trustee to continue to carry the stock of the Corning Glass Works and for instructions to the trustee. In that proceeding I represented the interest of Laura Houghton Harris who was then alive, and the interest of Mrs. Vail, the life beneficiary was represented by Charles E. Hughes, Sr. until during the course of that 471

472 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

proceeding he became Secretary of State, after which she was represented by Charles E. Hughes, Jr.

FREDERICK P. KING.

Sworn to before me this
7th day of January, 1927.

PHILIP J. DUNN—Referee.

Mr. Montgomery: I think we have covered the best way we can, the question of Mrs. Vail not having made a
473 will.

In closing I would like to state that this application for allowances we feel should be granted. We are asking an allowance to Mrs. Plumb of $50,000. annually, an allowance to the children, an allowance totaling $50,000. to be divided between the three of them, and an allowance of $2,400. to Mrs. Taft and $2,000. to each of the other sisters and brother.

From the testimony it appears that the average income for the last four or five years has been about $318,000. The total sum required to maintain Mrs. Vail at this date it is impossible to state approximately, but it certainly
474 will not reach on the outside $50,000. a year, thus leaving a balance of over $250,000. of income. The number of years that this trust has been in existence, the income has accumulated so that it is now considerably over $800,000. as shown by the testimony. That accumulated income is all invested and is bearing income itself. The real estate in Florida is valued in the neighborhood of about $433,000., and that we desire to sell as soon as possible so that when that is sold and invested it is fair to assume that the income would increase by about 5% of that amount or about somewheres in the neighborhood of $25,000. additional.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.

There is no question about the necessity of these allowances being granted so that the respective people to whom they are granted may continue to live in the way in which their social position and income of their mother really entitles them to live. 475

If Mrs. Vail were competent she would undoubtedly give them each a large allowance as she did while she was competent and up to within a year ago. In addition to that, Mrs. Vail's heirs-at-law, that is, her only surviving child and the guardian of the three grandsons who take the place of her deceased daughter, are perfectly willing that the allowances requested should be granted to the sisters and the brother of Mrs. Vail. Mrs. Plumb and these three grandchildren will divide between them upon Mrs. Vail's death, the whole of this estate so that the allowances cannot affect any person not interested in the estate. They are the remaindermen and they will get the whole estate divided among them upon Mrs. Vail's death. 476

Mrs. Plumb gets the income during her life from one-half of the estate so that the granting of these allowances will only affect the persons who are applying for them and they will eventually get the property upon Mrs. Vail's death. The accumulated income here amounting to about $800,000., upon Mrs. Vail's death will be divided between Mrs. Plumb and the three grand-children. 477

The trust fund created by the estate of Mr. Houghton will be divided in two upon Mrs. Vail's death and Mrs. Plumb will receive the income from one-half and the balance will be divided equally among the surviving children of Mrs. Harris, so that by granting these allowances the child and grandchildren will be simply getting now what they will eventually get in the end, with the exception of the small annual allowances asked for for the brother and sisters of Mrs. Vail, which they, the only persons interested in the estate are willing these sisters and brother should have.

478 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 14.*

I would like to correct the amount of the allowances to the sisters and brother. The allowance for Mrs. Taft is $3,000. because of her added responsibilities, and the brother and the other sisters $2,000. each.

We rest, your Honor.

Mr. King: On behalf of the General Guardian, I think his duty in the premises is to submit the interest of the children to the court for such disposition as the court may make, and as you will probably observe, it was the purport of the stipulation which was read into the record and acquiesced in, to establish an equality as be-
479 tween the petitioner and the children of Laura Houghton Harris, as evinced by the conduct of Mrs. Vail during her competency.

REFERENCE CLOSED.

No. 2869.

State of New York,
County of New York, ss.:

I, ARCHIBALD R. WATSON, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County, DO HEREBY CERTIFY,
480 That I have compared the preceding with the original Testimony before Referee on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of the whole of such original.

Filed. May 23, 1940.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
(Seal) hand and affixed my official seal, this 23rd day of May, 1940.

ARCHIBALD R. WATSON
County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court,
New York County.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.

481

SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY

REPORT OF REFEREE.

In the Matter

of the

Application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB for an allowance to be paid herself and others from the income accruing each year to HELEN HALL VAIL, an incompetent person.

482

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE COUNTY OF NEW YORK.

I, PHILIP J. DUNN, to whom the above matter was referred by Order of this Court signed at Special Term, Part I. thereof on the 26th day of November, 1926, to take proof of the facts alleged in the petition herein and to report to the Court with all convenient speed upon the matters referred to me with my opinion, do respectfully report as follows:

483

Before proceeding with the examination and hearing of the matter so referred to me I duly took and subscribed the statutory oath as Referee, and the same is hereto annexed.

The first hearing of this proceeding was duly held before me at my office at No. 165 Broadway, in the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 15th day of December, 1926, upon due notice to Messrs. Dean, King & Smith, attorneys for Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, and to Messrs. Geller, Rolston & Blanc,

484 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.*

attorneys for The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail, the said incompetent.

The following parties appeared at said hearing: your petitioner, by Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, her attorneys; Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of said infants, by Dean, King & Smith, his attorneys; and The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail by Geller, Rolston & Blanc, its attornys.

485 The testimony taken before me and such exhibits as are not now filed in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York, are annexed to this report.

I find as follows—

That the petitioner is the daughter of Helen Hall Vail by a prior marriage to Charles F. Houghton, deceased.

That said Helen Hall Vail was on the 11th day of August, 1926, duly adjudged by a Sheriff's Jury of New York County to be incompetent to manage herself or her affairs, and that by an Order of the Supreme Court of the County of New York entered on the 12th day of August, 1926, the findings of the said Sheriff's Jury were

486 in all respects, ratified, approved and confirmed, and The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company of New York City was appointed Committee of the property of said Helen Hall Vail, and MaBelle Houghton Plumb was appointed the Committee of the Person of said Helen Hall Vail.

That said Helen Hall Vail is seventy-one (71) years of age and is the owner of the following parcels of real property, upon each of which is erected a private dwelling: one parcel situated at Geneva, New York, which is valued at One Hundred and Forty Thousand Five Hundred and Seventy-seven and 65/100 ($140,577.65) Dollars, including lands, buildings and contents; one parcel situated at Spring Lake, New Jersey, which is valued at

Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.

487

Fifty Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-three and 30/100 ($50,953.30) Dollars, including lands, buildings and contents; one parcel at Palm Beach, Florida, which is valued at Four Hundred and Thirty-three Thousand Eight Hundred and Sixty-two and 83/100 Dollars ($433,862.83) including lands, buildings and contents.

That said parcels of real property produce no income and are not encumbered by any mortgages.

That said incompetent also owns jewelry valued at about One Hundred and Seventy-seven Thousand Four Hundred and Eighteen ($177,418.00) Dollars.

488

That said incompetent is a life beneficiary of a Trust created under the Last Will and Testament of Charles F. Houghton, deceased, her first husband, the income of which for the last four years has been as follows:

For the year 1923, ...	$240,209.22
" " " 1924	252,395.27
" " " 1925	308,732.20
" " " 1926 down to the 9th of December, 1926.	651,692.82

That the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company has in its possession as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, accumulated income received from the Estate of 489
Charles F. Houghton, deceased, and belonging to Helen Hall Vail amounting to $812,445.57.

That the incompetent was married to said Charles F. Houghton in 1878; that said Charles F. Houghton died on the 30th of March, 1897, leaving a last Will and testament which was admitted to probate in the Surrogate's Court, for the County of Steuben, in the State of New York, on the 17th day of April, 1897; that in and by said Will the residuary estate of said Charles F. Houghton was bequeathed and devised to The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Trustee to hold for the benefit of said

490 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.*

Helen Hall Vail during her life with directions to pay the income to her.

That thereafter the said Helen Hall Vail married one Charles D. Vail, who died in the year 1922.

That the said Helen Hall Vail by her first husband had three children, one of whom, Florence Houghton, died in infancy, one of whom, Laura Houghton Harris, died leaving three children, John H. Harris now eleven (11) years of age, William R. Harris, now nine (9) years of age, and David F. Harris, now six (6) years of age,
491 and your petitioner who is the only other and surviving child of said Helen Hall Vail.

That said Helen Hall Vail had no issue by her second marriage.

That the said infant children of Laura Houghton Harris reside with their Father, Ieuan Harris at Geneva, New York and that said Ieuan Harris has heretofore been appointed the General Guardian of said three children, and has duly qualified as such.

That at this hearing the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb at the request of the attorneys for Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and
492 David F. Harris, consented and agreed in the event that she survives her Mother, the incompetent, and thereby becomes entitled to a share of her Mother's estate either by the will or intestacy of the said Helen Hall Vail, any such share shall be charged with any allowance which may be awarded to the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb in this proceeding, to the exent if any by which such allowance exceeds in value or in amount the aggregate of any allowance or allowances which may be awarded in this proceeding to the General Guardian of the said infants John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, minors, and further consented and agreed that any order which may be made in this proceeding awarding an al-

Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.

493

lowance to her shall be conditioned in accordance with the above and shall provide that any award thereunder shall be allowed to her only by way of advancement and as such shall be accepted by her, provided that the order granting allowances shall direct, that if the total amount paid to the infants shall exceed the amount paid to her, that the excess paid to the infants shall be considered also as an advancement, and allowed to them as such.

That the last will and testament of said Charles F. Houghton deceased, directs that upon the death of his wife, the said Helen Hall Vail, his residuary estate be divided into two equal parts, one of said parts to be held for the benefit of his daughter, Laura, the income to be paid to her during her life, and upon her death leaving issue the principal of said part or share to be divided between her issue share and share alike. The other of said parts to be held for the benefit of his daughter, MaBelle, the income to be paid to her during her life, and upon her death leaving issue the principal of such part or share to be divided between her issue share and share alike.

494

That said MaBelle Houghton Plumb has one child, Joseph H. Plumb, Jr. who is now thirteen years of age.

That the said Laura Houghton married Ieuan Harris on the 16th day of July, 1914, and died on the 31st day of August, 1925, leaving a Last Will and Testament which was admitted to probate in the Office of the Surrogate's Court for the County of Steuben, in the State of New York, and that in and by said Will she devised and bequeathed all her property to her husband, Ieuan Harris; that her estate was appraised at $50,696.25., and consisted in part of real estate at Geneva, New York, appraised at $30,000.00, and the balance personal property.

495

That said Helen Hall Vail has surviving the following brother and sisters, and no others:

496 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.*

Edward Hageman Hall, 68 years of age, residing at 702 West End Avenue, New York City, who has a salary and other income aggregating about $7,000.00 per annum.

Mary Hall Taft, a widow, 79 years of age, residing at 425 Central Avenue, Orange, N. J., who has no income whatsoever and is entirely dependent upon her relatives. Said Mary Hall Taft has one daughter who is fifty years of age and is incapable of supporting herself in any way.

Elizabeth Hall Burdick, a widow, 75 years of age residing at Reed House, 537 East 121st Street, New York
497 City, who has no income whatsoever and is entirely dependent upon her relatives.

Abbey Ferrin, a widow, 66 years of age, residing at 616 Wolfs Lane, Pelham, New York, who has no property, except the house in which she lives, which she has been obliged to mortgage to obtain the necessary funds for her maintenance and support. Said Abbey Ferrin is bedridden and unable to do any work.

Lucy H. Ferris, a widow, 73 years of age, residing at Farrand Avenue, Highland Park, Michigan, who has no income whatsoever and is entirely dependent upon her relatives.

498 That until their marriage, Laura Houghton Harris and MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the daughters of the incompetent, made their home with their mother, who gave to each of them an annual allowance; these contributions were continued after the marriage of her daughters and were increased in amount; to each of them she gave a home of equal value and both before and after the marriage of her daughters, the incompetent manifested a disposition to benefit them by gifts of money and property. In making such benefactions, the incompetent treated her daughters equally and any gift to one was coincident with and characterized by a gift substantially similar in kind, value and amount to the other.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.

That prior to the time when the said Helen Hall Vail was declared incompetent she had repeatedly and over a long period of years evinced kindly feelings toward her brother and sisters by contributing various annual sums to their support and maintenance. 499

That all her said sisters have no property and are practically destitute, and it is necessary for their maintenance and support that the allowances which are hereinafter recommended should be granted. That the granting of all the allowances hereinafter recommended would coincide with the undoubted desires and intentions of the incompetent were she competent, as evidenced by the solicitude and generosity toward the several applicants, displayed by her during competency. 500

That the brother of said incompetent, Edward Hageman Hall, is self supporting but is married and his wife is and has been for some years very ill, and the said Hall has been required during the past fifteen years to devote a large portion of his income to paying doctors and hospital bills. He has also contributed largely to the support of his sisters. That the said Hall is now sixty-eight years of age and to maintain the position which his education entitles him to it is necessary that the allowance herein asked for, for his benefit be granted. 501

That said Helen Hall Vail is now at Dr. Macdonald's House, Central Valley, New York, to which institution she was committed by an Order of the Supreme Court dated the 10th day of December, 1926, where she has all the comforts which her position and affluence entitle her to have and are possible under the circumstances, including automobile, etc.

That the cost of maintaining said incompetent at Dr. Macdonald's House, supplying her with clothes and other necessaries for her care and maintenance and for her pleasure will not exceed the sum of $25,000. per annum.

502 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.*

That the total cost of maintaining the incompetent and her property, including the payment of taxes, etc. will fall far short of the sum of $50,000 per annum.

That the average annual income of the incompetent for the last four or five years has been about $318,000. and that after deducting the estimated cost of maintaining her and her property, i. e. $50,000. per annum there will remain a balance of income of over $250,000. per annum, a sum far in excess of all conceivable needs of the incompetent.

503 That the disease from which the said Helen Hall Vail is suffering is a progressive disease and the chances of her recovery are very slight, if any, and there is no probability of her being able to take care of herself or property.

That upon the death of said Helen Hall Vail one-half of the principal sum held for her benefit under the Will of said Charles F. Houghton, deceased, will vest in the said John H. Harris, William R. Harris, and David F. Harris, the income of the other one-half will be paid to the petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, a daughter of said Charles F. Houghton, deceased, during her life and upon her death the principal of said share will be divided among her issue.

504 That a diligent inquiry has been made to find out whether the said Helen Hall Vail has heretofore made a Will, but no Will has been found, and that upon the death intestate of the said Helen Hall Vail the accumulated income in possession of The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company will be divided equally between MaBelle Houghton Plumb, your petitioner, or her issue, and the children of Laura Houghton Harris, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, then surviving.

No Will of the incompetent having been discovered, the granting of allowances herein can interfere with no testamentary plan of the incompetent, and the inference is

Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.

505

clear from the past generosity displayed by the incompetent toward all the applicants herein, that the granting of allowances to them would accord with the intentions and the desires of the incompetent were she now competent to make them herself.

None of the parties to this proceeding has made any objections to the granting of allowances herein. The Committee of the Property of the incompetent has filed a cross-petition asking for instructions in regard to the relief prayed for in the petition by which this proceeding was instituted, and the petitioner, having stipulated that any order granting an allowance either to her or to the infant children of her sister, Laura Houghton Harris, shall be conditioned, as hereinbefore set forth, their General Guardian has submitted the interests of his wards to the protection of the Court.

506

After considering all the facts and circumstances, the advanced years of the incompetent and the incurable nature of her disease, and the fact that the annual income of the incompetent is vastly in excess of the amount required to maintain her in comfort and luxury, I recommend that there be granted annually to Mabelle Houghton Plumb an allowance of $50,000.; to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris the sum of $50,000., to be applied by him toward their maintenance and support; to Edward Hageman Hall an allowance of $2,000.; to Mary Hall Taft an allowance of $3,000.; to Elizabeth Hall Burdick an allowance of $2,000.; to Abbey Ferrin an allowance of $2,000., and to Lucy Hall Ferris an allowance of $2,000. The Committee should be instructed accordingly.

507

Dated, January 12th, 1927.

Respectfully submitted,

PHILIP J. DUNN.

508 **Plaintiff's Exhibit 16.**

At a Special Term, Part II, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, held in and for the County of New York, at the County Court House, in the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 14th day of January, 1927.

Present: Honorable Richard P. Lydon, Justice

509 In the Matter

of

the application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for an allowance to be paid herself and others from the income accruing each year to Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person.

On reading and filing the petition herein of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, applying for an allowance each year out of the income of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent per-
510 son, for herself and others, and the cross-petition of The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent, asking for the instruction of this Court as to relief prayed for in said petition, and upon the Order of Reference herein, entered in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the 26th day of November, 1926, wherein and whereby the matter was referred to Philip J. Dunn, Esquire, of the City of New York, as sole referee, to take proof of the facts alleged in the petition and to report to the Court, with all convenient speed upon the matters referred to him by the order, with his opinion, and the

Plaintiff's Exhibit 16.

said petitioner MaBelle Houghton Plumb, by Messrs. Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, her attorneys, having duly moved for the confirmation of the said Referee's Report, and the other parties hereto having duly waived further notice of said motion, and said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee as aforesaid, having duly appeared upon such motion by Messrs. Geller, Rolston & Blanc, its attorneys, and having submitted the interests of the incompetent to the protection of the Court, and Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, having duly apeared upon said motion by Messrs. Dean, King & Smith their attorneys, and having submitted the interests of his wards to the protection of the Court, and due deliberation having been had thereon, and

On reading and filing the affidavit of Philip J. Dunn, Esquire, the Referee, the affidavit of John S. Montgomery, Esquire, a member of the firm of Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, the attorneys for the petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the affidavit of Frederic P. King, Esquire, a member of the firm of Dean, King & Smith, the attorneys for Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, and the affidavit of Charles Angulo, Esquire, a member of the firm of Geller, Rolston & Blanc, the attorneys for the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent, with respect to the services rendered by each of them in this proceeding, and

On reading and filing the testimony taken at said hearing and the report of the said Referee, and it appearing to my satisfaction that the income of the said incompetent for the last four or five years has averaged over

514 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 16.*

Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, and that to maintain and support the incompetent, and to care for her property, there cannot reasonably be expended a greater sum than Fifty Thousand Dollars, and that the said Helen Hall Vail has not made a last will and testament and that the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the only surviving child of said incompetent, or her issue, and the said John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, the three children of a deceased daughter of said incompetent, or their issue, will be, upon the death of said incompetent,
515 the only heirs-at-law and next-of-kin of said incompetent, and the only persons entitled to share in her estate, and this Court having found and hereby finding, upon the evidence submitted before said Referee and to this Court, that if the said incompetent Helen Hall Vail were in the possession of her mental faculties and in all respects competent, she would desire that the allowance hereinafter fixed be made to the persons hereinafter designated, and would make such allowance to such persons out of her property.

NOW ON MOTION of MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE attorneys for said petitioner, and no one appearing in
516 opposition thereto, it is

ORDERED that the report of said Referee be and the same is hereby in all respects confirmed, it is

FURTHER ORDERED that The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent person, pay out of the income of the said incompetent, each year in equal quarterly payments the following sums to the following named persons

To MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB, the petitioner, the daughter of said incompetent, the sum of Fifty Thousand ($50,000.) Dollars,

Plaintiff's Exhibit 16.

517

To IEUAN HARRIS, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of Fifty Thousand ($50,000.) Dollars,

To EDWARD HAGEMAN HALL, the brother of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars,

To MARY HALL TAFT, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Three Thousand Dollars,

To ELIZABETH HALL BURDICK, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars, 518

To ABBE FERRIN, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars,

To LUCY HALL FERRIS, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars, and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the said The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as Committee of the Property of the incompetent, pay out of the income in its hands the following sums

519

To PHILIP J. DUNN, ESQUIRE, the Referee, the sum of Three Thousand and Five Hundred Dollars, as and for the allowance to which he is entitled, for his services herein

To MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE, as attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, the sum of Five Thousand Dollars, as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein, together with the sum of Two hundred and seventy-eight 90/100—to cover their disbursements herein

520 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 16.*

To Dean, King & Smith, as attorneys for Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of One Thousand and Five Hundred Dollars, as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein

To Geller, Rolston & Blanc, as attorneys for The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail the incompetent, the sum
521 of One Thousand Dollars, as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein, and it is

Further ordered that if upon the death of Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent, it shall appear that the total allowances received by MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and the total aggregate allowances received by the said three grandchildren, John H. Harris, William R. Harris, and David F. Harris, or their guardian, Ieuan Harris, for their account, shall not be equal to each other, that the excess received by either MaBelle Houghton Plumb, or the said three grandchildren, or their guardian, shall be
522 considered as an advancement, and it is

Further ordered that the application of the said Committee for instructions be and the same is hereby granted and that said Committee be and is hereby instructed to make the payments hereinbefore specified as the Committee of the said incompetent's property.

Enter

R. P. L.
J. S. C.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 17. 523

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

New York County

In the Matter

of the

Application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for an allowance to be paid to herself and others from the unexpended surplus income now in the possession of the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of 524

Helen Hall Vail,

an incompetent person.

To the Supreme Court of the State of New York:

Your petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, respectfully shows:

1. That she is forty-nine years of age and a daughter of Helen Hall Vail, and resides at Geneva, in the State of New York. 525

2. That said Helen Hall Vail was, on the 11th day of August, 1926, duly adjudged to be incompetent to manage herself and her affairs, by a Sheriff's Jury of New York County, duly called to inquire into said matter, and that by an Order of the Supreme Court of New York County, entered on the 12th day of August, 1926, the findings of the said Sheriff's Jury were in all respects ratified, approved and confirmed, and your petitioner was appointed the Committee of the Person of said Helen Hall Vail,

526 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 17.*

and The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, now the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, a New York corporation, was appointed the Committee of her property. That both the Committee of the Person and the Committee of the Property of said Helen Hall Vail have duly qualified and are now acting as such. That, as your petitioner is informed and verily believes, the said Helen Hall Vail is suffering from cerebral arterio-sclerosis, with dementia, hallucinations and senile arteriselerotic chorea, and that her condition holds out no hope for recovery.

527 3. That said Helen Hall Vail is eighty years of age and is a widow.

4. That said Helen Hall Vail was married in 1878 to Charles F. Houghton, who died on the 30th day of March, 1896. That in the year 1902 the said Helen Hall Vail was married to Charles Vail who died in the year 1922. That the said Helen Hall Vail has had three children, all by her first marriage, one of whom, Florence Houghton, died without issue; one of whom, Laura Houghton Harris, died leaving three children, John H. Harris, now sixteen years of age, William R. Harris, now fifteen
528 years of age, and David F. Harris now twelve years of age; and your petitioner, who is the only other and surviving child of said Helen Hall Vail. That the said infant children of said Laura Houghton Harris, deceased, reside with their Father, Ieuan Harris, at Salisbury, Connecticut, and that Ieuan Harris has heretofore been appointed the General Guardian of the said three children and has duly qualified as such.

5. That in and by his Last Will and Testament the said Charles F. Houghton, deceased, the Father of your Petitioner and of said Laura Houghton Harris, deceased, gave, devised and bequeathed his residuary estate in

Plaintiff's Exhibit 17.

529

rust, and directed the Trustee thereof to apply the rents, ncome and profits thereof to the use of said Helen Hall Vail during her life, and upon her death to divide the same into two equal parts, and to apply the income of one of said parts to the use of his daughter, the said Laura Houghton Harris, deceased, during her life, and he income of the other of said parts to the use of your petitioner, during her life; with a further provision, that upon the death of either of said daughters leaving issue her surviving, the part so held in trust for her should rest in her issue, share and share alike.

530

6. That your petitioner has one child, Joseph H. Plumb, Junior, who is now nineteen years of age.

7. That the said Laura Houghton Harris died on the 31st day of August, 1925, and that prior to said date the said Helen Hall Vail had been in the habit of contributing out of the income received by her from said Trust created for her benefit by the said Charles F. Houghton, deceased, he Father of your petitioner, various annual sums for he support and maintenance of her two daughters, the said Laura Houghton Harris, and your petitioner.

531

8. On information and belief that said City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of Helen Hall Vail upon its appointment as Committee on the 12th day of August, 1926, entered into possession of all the property of the incompetent and has collected the income and profits of the said property since that date.

9. On information and belief that said City Bank Farmers Trust Company as such Committee filed its last annual Inventory and Account as of the 31st day of December, 1931, showing in its possession principal of

532 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 17.*

$956,805.78 invested as therein set forth and accumulated income of $1,051,078.55, also invested as therein set forth.

10. On information and belief that the said $1,051,078.55 of income represents the total amount of accumulated surplus income since the date of the appointment of the Committee.

11. On information and belief that the income of the incompetent comes from two sources—(1) The income
533 from her estate held by the Committee, and (2) the income from the Estate of Charles F. Houghton, deceased, her husband. From both these sources the total annual income received by the incompetent has been as follows—

For the year ending	
December 31st, 1926 (August 12th to December 31st)	$173,269.27
December 31st, 1927	426,639.23
December 31st, 1928	453,585.60
December 31st, 1929	431,730.74
December 31st, 1930	447,202.06
December 31st, 1931	460,183.62

534

12. On information and belief that from the income received by the said Committee for the year 1931 amounting to..... $460,183.62

there was paid, pursuant to an Order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, dated the 14th of January, 1927..... $109,000.00

there was expended in the maintenance of the incompetent.... 17,716.18

Plaintiff's Exhibit 17.

535

there was expended in the maintenance of the property of the said incompetent a total of...	92,371.20	219 087.38
leaving a balance of unexpended income for the year 1931 of...		$241,096.24

which is included in the aforesaid accumulated income, i. e. the sum of $1,051,078.55.

13. That your petitioner believes, were her Mother competent and mentally normal, she, her Mother, would have distributed from time to time to your petitioner, her 536
daughter, and her grandchildren, a substantial part of the accumulated income.

WHEREFORE your petitioner prays for an Order directing the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the Property of said incompetent, to pay out of the unexpended surplus income now in the possession of the Committee to your Petitioner the sum of TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND THOUSAND ($250,000.00) DOLLARS, and to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris, and David F. Harris, infants the sum of TWO HUNDREED AND FIFTY THOUSAND ($250,000.00) DOL- 537
LARS, and that such other and further relief may be granted to your petitioner herein as shall be deemed proper.

Dated, New York, April 26, 1932.

MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB
Petitioner

538 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 17.*

STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK } ss:

MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB, being duly sworn, says: That she is the petitioner named in the above entitled proceeding; that she has read the foregoing petition and knows the contents thereof, and that the same is true to her own knowledge, except as to the matters therein stated to be alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, she believes it to be true.

539

MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB.

Sworn to before me this
26th day of April, 1932.

THOS. T. GRACE,
Notary Public,
New York County #150.

540

541

Plaintiff's Exhibit 19.

SUPREME COURT

COUNTY OF NEW YORK

ANSWER

In the Matter

of the

542

application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB for an allowance to be paid to herself and others from the unexpended surplus income now in the possession of City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the property of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an incompetent person.

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, as Committee of 543
the property of Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent person above named, by its attorneys, Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, for an answer to the petition herein, alleges on information and belief as follows:

1. Said respondent is a domestic corporation having its principal place of business at No. 22 Williams Street, Borough of Manhattan, City, County and State of New York, and on or about the 12th day of August, 1926 was duly appointed committee of the property of the above named incompetent by this Court, and on or about said

544 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 19.*

date duly qualified and entered into possession of the property of said incompetent and has since continued to act and is now acting as such committee of the property.

2. Said respondent is advised and alleges that it is merely the custodian or bailiff of the property of the incompetent and as such is solely the agent or representative of the Court to administer and manage the same under the supervision and control of the Court, in accordance with its instructions and directions, and accordingly
545 said respondent respectfully suggests that a Special Guardian be appointed herein for the said incompetent, to appear and defend this proceeding in her behalf, and to take any and all steps that may be necessary for the protection of her rights.

3. Said respondent further respectfully suggests that a Referee be appointed herein to take proof and report to this Court with all convenient speed concerning the present condition of the incompetent, including the unlikelihood of her recovery, the present and probable future condition of the incompetent's estate, her present
546 and future financial needs, the present and probable future needs of the petitioner and those for whom a distribution is sought herein, the custom of the incompetent in respect of donations to her children, her probable intent in respect of the distribution sought on this application, the existence or non-existence of a Will, and her presumptive distributees upon her death, and that upon the coming in of such report this Court make such order in the premises, concerning the disposition of the incompetent's property, as to this Court may seem just and proper, and that said respondent be instructed accordingly.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 19.

547

WHEREFORE, said respondent respectfully submits the rights and interests of said incompetent in this proceeding to the protection of the Court.

TAYLOR, BLANC, CAPRON & MARSH,
Attorneys for City Bank Farmers
Trust Company as Committee of
the Property of said incompetent,
Office and Post Office Address:
22 Exchange Place,
New York, N. Y.

548

State of New York,
County of New York, } ss:

W. G. CHISOLM, being duly sworn, deposes and says: That he is a Trust Officer of City Bank Farmers Trust Company, the respondent named in the foregoing Answer; that he has read the foregoing answer and knows the contents thereof; that the same is true to his own knowledge except as to the matters therein stated to be alleged upon information and belief, and that as to those matters he believes it to be true.

549

W. G. CHISOLM

Sworn to before me this
2nd day of May, 1932.

WILFRED H. McCRACKEN
Notary Public, New York County
N. Y. Co. Clk's No. 104
Comm. Exp. Mch. 30, 1934

No. 2861

550 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 19.*

State of New York, }
County of New York, } ss.:

I, ARCHIBALD R. WATSON, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County, Do HEREBY CERTIFY, That I have compared the preceding with the original Motion Papers on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of the whole of such original.

551 Filed. May 5, 1932

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, this 23 day (Seal) of May, 1940.

ARCHIBALD R. WATSON,
County Clerk and Clerk of the
Supreme Court, New York County.

552

Plaintiff's Exhibit 21.

553

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY

ANSWER OF IEUAN HARRIS GENERAL GUARDIAN

In the Matter

of the

Application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB for an allowance to be paid to herself and others from the unexpended surplus income now in the possession of City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of 554

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an incompetent person.

The respondent, Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, by Dean, King, Smith and Taylor, his attorneys, answering the petition herein, alleges: 555

FIRST: That heretofore and on or about the 11th day of December, 1925, pursuant to a decree duly made and entered in the Surrogate's Court of Ontario County, New York, the said Ieuan Harris was duly constituted and appointed the General Guardian of the persons and property of the said infants; that he has duly qualified as such General Guardian; that letters of General Guardianship have been issued to him as aforesaid and he is now the General Guardian of the said infants.

556 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 21.*

SECOND: That the infant, John H. Harris, is now sixteen years of age; that the infant, William R. Harris, is now fourteen years of age and the infant, David F. Harris, is now twelve years of age, and all of the said infants reside with the respondent, who is their father and General Guardian.

THIRD: That the said infants are strangers to all and singular the matters and things set forth in the petition in this proceeding and claim such rights and interests therein as they may have and to which they may be
557 entitled.

WHEREFORE, the respondent submits the rights and interests of his wards in this proceeding to the protection of the Court.

IEUAN HARRIS,
Respondent and General Guardian of
John H. Harris, William R. Harris
and David F. Harris, infants.

DEAN, KING, SMITH & TAYLOR,
558 Attorneys for General Guardian,
Office and Post Office Address,
160 Broadway,
Borough of Manhattan,
New York, N. Y.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 23.

559

At a Special Term, Part I. of the Supreme Court, held in and for the County Of New York at the County Court House in the Borough of Manhattan, City, County and State of New York, on the 4th day of May, 1932.

Present: Honorable Phoenix Ingraham, Justice.

Order

560

In the Matter

of the

application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for an allowance to be paid to herself and others from the unexpended surplus income now in possession of City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the property of

Helen Hall Vail,

an incompetent person.

561

MaBelle Houghton Plumb, having heretofore on due notice of motion presented her petition dated and duly verified the 26th day of April, 1932, praying for an order directing City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent, to pay out of the unexpended surplus income now in the possession of the Committee to the petitioner MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the sum of $250,000, and to Ienan Harris, as general guardian of John H. Harris William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infant parties, the sum of

562 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 23.*

$250,000. and for such other and further relief as may be just as from the said petition more fully appears, and said motion having duly come on to be heard.

NOW, on reading and filing the notice of motion dated April 26th, 1932, and the said petition of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, verified April 26th, 1932, with due proof of service of the said papers upon Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, on behalf of City Bank Farmers Trust Company of New York, as Committee of the property of the said
563 incompetent, and upon the notice of appearance of Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, attorneys for the Committee of the property of said incompetent, and the answer of City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, verified the 2nd day of May, 1932, and upon the notice of appearance, of Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, attorneys for Ienan Harris, as general guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, and upon reading and filing the affidavit of Theodore W. Neumann, M.D., duly sworn to the 3rd day of May, 1932, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the Court from said affidavit that the said Helen Hall Vail
564 is an incompetent person and that service of the papers in this proceeding upon said incompetent personally might result in injuring the health and mental condition of said Helen Hall Vail and that the Court in its discretion should dispense with the delivery of a copy of said papers to said incompetent in person, and upon filing the opinion of the Court,

NOW, on motion of Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, attorneys for the petitioner, it is

Ordered that Cornelius J. Smyth, Esq., of 1 East 43rd St. of the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, be

Plaintiff's Exhibit 23.

565

and he hereby is appointed special guardian for and on behalf of the said Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent, to appear and defend this proceeding on behalf of said Helen Hall Vail and protect the rights of the said incompetent, on filing the usual affidavit and consent, and is hereby designated to receive service of all papers herein on behalf of said incompetent, and it is further

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that upon the service and filing of the answer of said special guardian as aforesaid on behalf of said incompetent person, that the proceeding and application be and the same hereby are referred to Townsend Morgan, Esq., of the Borough of Manhattan, 50 B'way, City of New York, to hear and take testimony of the respective parties, act and take proof upon all questions arising in connection therewith and report, to this Court with his opinion with all convenient speed; and it is further

566

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that delivery of a copy of the papers in this proceeding and of all other papers in this proceeding to said Helen Hall Vail in person be, and the same hereby is, dispensed with.

567

Enter,

P. I.
J. S. C.

568 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 23.*

No. 2882

State of New York
County of New York } ss.:

I, Archibald R. Watson, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County,

Do hereby certify, That I have compared the preceding with the original order on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of the whole
569 of such original.

Filed, May 5, 1932

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, this 23 day of May, 1940.

(Seal) Archibald R. Watson
County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County.

570

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY

In the Matter of the Application

of

MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB for an allowance to be paid to herself and others from the unexpended surplus income now in the possession of City Bank-Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of HELEN HALL VAIL, an incompetent person.

No. 50 Broadway, New York City,
May 13, 1932, 10 o'clock A. M.

Before: TOWNSEND MORGAN, Esq., Referee.

APPEARANCES:

MESSRS. MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE,
Attorneys for the Petitioner, by
MR. MONTGOMERY, of counsel.

MESSRS. TAYLOR, BLANC, CAPRON & MARSH,
Attorneys for the Committee, City Bank-Farmers
Trust Company, by MESSRS. CHARLES ANGULO
and THOMAS K. EGAN, of counsel.

CORNELIUS J. SMYTH, Esq.,
Special Guardian for the Incompetent,
Helen H. Vail.

MESSRS. DEAN, KING, SMITH & TAYLOR,
Attorneys for Ienan Harris, General Guardian,
by FREDERICK P. KING, Esq., of counsel.

574 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

(Met pursuant to notice.)

(The Referee states he has taken and filed the oath of office.)

(It is stipulated by and between counsel for the parties hereto, the Special Guardian not objecting, that the statutory fee for the Referee be waived, and that the same be fixed by the Court.)

(It is stipulated by and between all parties hereto that Edward J. O'Connell, Certified Shorthand Reporter, of
575 150 Nassau Street, New York City, be employed to stenographically report the hearings herein, and that he furnish an original copy of the transcript for filing purposes, and carbon copies to all counsel, and that he shall be paid at the rate of 75 cents per page for the ribbon copy, and 25 cents per page for each carbon copy furnished to counsel.)

Mr. Montgomery: Mr. Referee, this is an application for an allowance of $250,000 from the estate of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent, to her daughter Mrs. Plumb, and also for an allowance of $250,000 from the estate to Mr. Harris, who is general guardian of the three
576 grandchildren of Mrs. Vail, their mother having died some years ago. Mrs. Vail was adjudged incompetent to handle her own affairs, and was committed to the MacDonald's House, at Central Valley, New York.

Dr. Theodore W. Neumann, a witness, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

By the Referee:

Q. State your full name. A. Dr. Theodore W. Neumann.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

577

Q. Where do you live? A. Central Valley, New York.

Direct Examination by Mr. Montgomery:

Q. What is your occupation, Doctor? A. Physician.

Q. Are you a qualified examiner in lunacy? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know Mrs. Helen Hall Vail? A. I do.

Q. The incompetent in this proceeding? A. I do.

Q. Is she an inmate of Dr. MacDonald's House at Central Valley, New York? A. Yes, sir.

578

Q. When was she admitted to that institution? A. She was admitted first for observation on September 16th, 1926. She was committed, legally committed, to us on December 10th, 1926.

Q. Have you had charge of Mrs. Vail ever since she has been at Dr. MacDonald's House? A. Yes, sir.

Q. How often have you seen her during that period? A. Every day that I am at the institution, which is almost every day. I see her at least once, sometimes three or four times.

Q. Will you please state what, in your opinion, is the nature of her malady? A. Mrs. Vail is suffering from a form of mental disease which is known medically as

579

psychosis or dementia with cerebral arterio sclerosis. This is characterized by confusion and delusions. She further is suffering with a physical condition which is known as chorea, which is a convulsive state.

Q. Has her physical condition improved since she has been at the hospital? A. No, sir.

Q. Has her mental condition improved? A. No, sir.

Q. Is there more outward evidence of her physical condition today than there was at the time she was committed at the institution? A. Yes, sir; almost constantly she displays these convulsive movements of her whole body,

580 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

the muscles of her whole body, or muscles of an arm, head, or leg. This is very much more marked. It interferes with her walking. It interferes with her speech. Her speech at times is very difficult to understand. It does not interfere with her eating, as yet. When she is sleeping these convulsive movements disappear.

Q. Is there, in your opinion, any hope of her recovery? A. No, sir.

Q. Doctor, is that a disease that comes on suddenly, or is it one that comes on gradually? A. As a general rule;
581 for a condition based on cerebral arterio sclerosis, is to come on insidiously over a period of years, but so gradually that even those who are closest to the patient fail to recognize it until it becomes of such proportions as to usually cause the patient to be committed and taken care of.

Q. Do you know whether Mrs. Vail made a will or not, Doctor? A. I do not know, no, sir.

Q. Have you ever seen one at the MacDonald House, at all? A. I have not, sir.

Mr. Montgomery: I think that is all, Mr. Refe-
582 ree, unless there is cross examination.

Mr. Angulo: I suggest that the special guardian, if he wants to, should first examine.

Cross Examination by Mr. Smyth:

Q. How long has the patient been in your charge? A. Going on six years.

Q. How many days a week do you see her? A. Well, I should say I see her six days a week on an average.

Q. And have you visited her that way ever since she has been at Dr. Macdonald's House? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has she any lucid and rational intervals? A. No.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

583

sir, her mental state now is one of general confusion. She has no insight into her mental condition, nor does she appreciate her surroundings as they actually are.

Q. Is she capable at all of judging of her estate and her means? A. I should say not, sir.

Q. You say she could not at any time pass on her estate and decide questions about investment of money, or how it should be invested, or anything like that? A. No, sir, for the simple reason that her whole mental condition is controlled by other thoughts, her delusion thoughts, her hallucinations, that coupled with her confusion. For 584
instance, her condition is changeable one day or for a portion of a day she may be entirely contented with her surroundings. At all times she feels that she is more or less proprietress of the institution, or that portion in which she lives. She feels that she is very much younger than she actually is. She—occasionally feels, that within probably a short time some young man is coming to marry her, to take her away. Her thoughts are concerned with other things than her estate.

Q. How old is she, in your opinion? A. Our records show that she will be 77 in August, 1932.

Q. Do her relatives visit her? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know those relatives? A. Yes, sir. 585

Q. Do you know her daughter, Mrs. Plumb? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does she recognize her daughter, for instance, when she calls? A. Yes, yes, but there are times that she refuses to see her daughter. She refuses to see the doctors occasionally on the ground that she has too much other important business, and things like that, to occupy her mind.

Q. Is her condition curable? A. This is a progressive condition. It is not curable. It tends to become progressively, worse.

586 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Q. The condition will get worse, in your opinion? A. It has during the past five years, and I think the situation is such that it will continue to get worse.

Q. You feel no hope of her recovery at all? A. My general experience with cases of this kind, it leads me to believe there is no hope for her.

Q. Has she ever tried to escape from up there? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is this an organic trouble that affects the mind? A. Yes, sir, it is an organic condition. It is a condition
587 of the arteries of the brain which cause softness of certain portions of the brain so as to show on her physical side the lack of connection between the fine movements also changes in her thought and mentality. It shows a deterioration and replacement of ordinary normal thoughts by ones that are delusional and unreal thoughts.

Q. What kind of quarters does she occupy up there? A. It is a suite.

Q. What does the suite consist of? A. She has a bedroom, sitting room, bath, and another room which is a sun room—The rooms are all connected on the same floor, but in one there is more sun. That is the reason
588 that the extra room was taken.

Q. Where is this Dr. MacDonald's House, that sanitarium? A. At Central Valley.

Q. How large a place is that; what kind of a place is it? A. It is a licensed institution that is licensed under the State of New York Commission of Mental Hygiene. It occupies 250 acres. It has several buildings, large buildings. While it is only licensed to take forty patients, under ordinary standards you can accommodate anywhere from 100 to 150 patients, but most of the patients require suites and cottages, and take a number of rooms.

Q. Has she a nurse? A. She has two day nurses, and

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

589

one night nurse. She requires constant attention because of her physical condition.

Q. For how long a period has she had two day nurses and one night nurse? A. Since she was admitted.

Q. Are there any other doctors in attendance besides you, Doctor? A. Three; Dr. Charles W. Pilgrim, Dr. T. D. MacDonald, Dr. John H. Richards.

Q. Did she ever go out of her rooms? A. Yes, she goes out daily, in fair weather, generally motoring.

Q. That is to say, she takes a trip out in the country around Central Valley in an automobile, every day? A. 590
Yes, sir, every fair day.

Q. For her comfort and convenience is there anything else that could be done for her? A. I would say no. She lives a very comfortable life, an old lady in her dotage, very much as she would in her own home. She has her own furniture, everything she cares to have, anything she cares to express a wish for is always forthcoming.

Q. There is nothing denied her that money could buy? A. Absolutely nothing denied her. We have been constantly told by relatives that if at any time there is anything, no matter what it is, that she expresses a desire 591
for, she should have it. We have always followed that rule. It is a standing order.

By the Referee:

Q. Was that suggestion made by Mrs. Plumb? A. Yes.

Q. You mentioned some other doctors there. Do you know whether they share the same opinion of the incompetent as you do? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it is the same as expressed by you? A. I am expressing the composite opinion of the staff.

592 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Q. Have you ever been present when Mrs. Plumb called on the incompetent? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you observe anything as to their relations? A. Yes, sir; there were times when the mother is in a mood when she greets her amiably—I won't say effusively—but greets her kindly. There are other times when she treats her rather badly. Other times when she refuses to see her. Other times when she has come we thought it was not best for the mother because she was already in an excited state, and it would not do the mother any
593 good.

Q. Having in mind those various meetings you have described, would you say that the relationship between mother and daughter was kindly? A. I would say so, yes, sir.

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. Who pays the bill which you render? A. Well, now, that is part of an organization I have very little to do with. I take care of the medical problems. I think they are paid by a trust company, but that is a point that I could not tell you, to be perfectly honest. I do not know
594 anything about the financial arrangements.

Q. Has anybody ever tried to put any limit on what was spent for her? A. Absolutely not.

Q. Has there ever been any recommendations of yours for the expenditure of money for her comfort or convenience, or for her physical or mental well-being that were denied? A. Absolutely not, sir.

Q. Do you know of any denial made on any recommendations of these other doctors who have been up there? A. Nothing, sir.

Q. In other words, she has always had every comfort and convenience and every luxury, and every medical at-

595

tention that you think could possibly be necessary for her? A. To be perfectly honest, sometimes things which we recommend be sent her are exceeded in quantity and in quality.

Q. Do you feel, as far as taking care of this woman, this incompetent, that everything is being done that money could do to make her lot as easy as possible? A. I do, sir.

Q. Have outside alienists ever been called in to examine her? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you consulted with those? A. Yes, sir. Dr. 596
Riley and Dr. Cornwall.

Q. Did they make any suggestions? A. Nothing, sir.

Q. What opinion did they have of her condition? A. Their opinion was substantially the same as ours at the time they were called in.

Q. And are they specialists in mental diseases? A. They are specialists in mental diseases, one I know is connected with the Neurological Institute, Medical Centre, and I think the other one is too. I am quite sure he is.

Mr. Smyth: That is all.

Cross Examination by Mr. King: 597

Q. As I understand it, this disease from which Mrs. Vail suffers is a disease of old age? A. Yes, sir.

Q. As age increases it never becomes any better? A. Worse, sir.

Q. And her condition as it is at the present time is likely to be accentuated as time goes on? A. Yes, sir, it has been for over a period of five years.

Q. Have you observed Mrs. Vail's condition with respect to the nurses? A. Yes.

Q. The same variability characterize those conditions

598 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

with the doctors and nurses as with Mrs. Plumb? A. Yes.

Q. So in her relationship with them she was pleasant with them? A. Yes.

Q. And other times she refuses to see them? A. Yes, at other times she refuses to see them. We have to switch around to pay her a visit, and one of the other doctors would have to go in and make the visit.

Q. Does she seem to have power of concentration in her daily life? A. No, sir.

599 Q. Does she read? A. Not as much now as she did. At present she would prefer look at magazines that have pictures.

Q. Does she undertake correspondence? A. No, she has not written since she came to us.

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. Would you allow her to write? A. She has a desk, and she has paper and pencil.

Q. It is within the rules of the House that she could write a letter if she wanted to and send it out? A. Absolutely, sir; anything she wants.

600

By Mr. Angulo:

Q. Doctor, is there any record in medical history of a case like this where there was a recovery? A. To my knowledge there is no such case of recovery.

Q. Is there any possibility of improvement? A. There might be a temporary improvement. There is a possibility, but the probability is very remote.

Q. And is there any possibility of such temporary improvement that might lead to a lucid interval? A. Very remote. Possibly. Her condition has advanced so far.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

Mr. Angulo: All right. That is all.

The Referee: Is that all, Mr. Special Guardian?
Mr. Smyth: Yes.

THEO W. NEUMANN MD.

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 17 day of May, 1932.

DOROTHY JONES
Notary Public.
Kings Co. Clerk's No. 194 Reg. No. 3141.
N. Y. Co. Clerk's No. 295 Reg. No. 31-197.
Commission expires March 30, 1933.

WARREN L. MURRAY, called as a witness, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

By the Referee:

Q. State your full name. A. Warren L. Murray.
Q. Where do you live? A. 7201 Ridge Boulevard, Brooklyn, New York.

Direct Examination by Mr. Montgomery:

Q. Mr. Murray, will you please state what your occupation is? A. Trust clerk in the administration department, City Bank & Farmers Trust Company.
Q. How long have you been with the City Bank-Farmers Trust Company? A. Three years.
Q. Do you know when the City Bank-Farmers Trust Company was appointed Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail? A. Yes, sir, on August 12th, 1926.

604 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Q. At that time was the name of City Bank-Farmers Trust Company? A. Farmers Loan & Trust Company.

Q. And it is still the Committee of the property of the incompetent? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you state the amount of property which came into the possession of the Trust Company upon its appointment? A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Smyth: I think there ought to be offered in evidence the order appointing—

605 Mr. Montgomery: I took it those were all in evidence in the other proceeding for an allowance. I thought they are all on file and we can offer copies if you want them. We have not the originals here.

The Referee: I think it would be well to say they are on file, and that you offer the copies, and there is no objection.

Mr. Angulo: Couldn't we stipulate all papers and testimony taken in the former proceeding, and all papers filed in connection with the proceedings in the estate of this incompetent be deemed in

606 evidence?

The Referee: If it is agreeable to you.

Mr. Montgomery: It is agreeable to us.

Mr. King: I would like to have that. I intended to offer the records in the other proceeding.

Mr. Angulo: I can file them here.

(Discussion off the record.)

It is hereby stipulated that all the papers on file in the Supreme Court, New York County, in connection with the former proceeding entitled "In the Matter of the Application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for Allowance to be Paid to Herself and others from the Income Accruing each year, Helen

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

607

Hall Vail, incompetent person", and all the testimony taken in said proceeding, as well as all of the papers and proceedings had upon the original application adjudging the said Helen Hall Vail incompetent and to appoint a Committee of her property, to be treated as being in evidence in this present proceeding with the same effect as if offered herein.

Mr. King: I take it that includes also exhibits which were part of the testimony.

Mr. Angulo: It says all papers.

608

The Referee: Is that satisfactory to everybody, including the special guardian?

Mr. Smyth: Are the accounts in as exhibits in that other proceeding?

Mr. Montgomery: No, I think not. They have been succeeded by that proceeding. Here are all the accounts. They are all on file, and that stipulation might also apply to the annual inventories and accounts that have been filed by the Committee of the incompetent.

Mr. Smyth: I would like to have them in the record.

609

The Referee: As I understand it, those applications that were made were granted?

Mr. Montgomery: Yes, sir.

The Referee: And not in conflict in any respect with the application that is now made here?

Mr. Montgomery: No, sir. Is that satisfactory, Mr. Smyth?

Mr. Smyth: So that now there is in evidence these annual accounts of the Committee of the property?

Mr. Montgomery: Yes.

610 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Mr. Smyth: They are since the time when the Committee was appointed, the original Committee?

Mr. Montgomery: Yes. We are going to put in the actual figures.

Mr. Smyth: As the pertinent figures?

Mr. Montgomery: Yes.

Mr. Smyth: All right.

(The reporter reads as follows: "Q. Can you state the amount of property which came into the possession of the Trust Company upon its appoint-
611 ment? A. Yes, sir.")

The Witness (Continuing former answer): $1,025,095.61.

Q. That belonged to the incompetent? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the amount of principal that the Committee now has in its possession? A. $954,599.08.

Q. Will you explain the difference between the amount that the company received on the date of its appointment, and the amount you now have on hand as capital or principal? A. There were some assets sold from time to time at prices, some of which were lower and some
612 higher than the inventory values. This left in our possession, on December 31st, 1931, capital inventoried at $954,599.08.

Q. Will you please state the source of income received by the Committee for the account of the incompetent? A. The Committee of property receives from the trust fund created under the will of Charles F. Houghton, the incompetent's first husband, certain income, and the Committee receives income from the property received on its appointment which belonged to the incompetent, and also income from the surplus income which has been invested from time to time since our appointment.

Q. Will you please state the amount of income received

613

from these sources for the year 1926? A. During the year 1926, from the date of our appointment, we received $153,269.27.

Q. Will you please state what payments were made out of that income during that year? A. From the date of the appointment of the Committee to the 31st of December, 1926, the Committee expended income as follows: For the personal maintenance of the incompetent $12,696.72; for the maintenance of other property—

Q. That is real property, is it not? A. I was just going to say, for the maintenance of other property, including real estate, $15,491.82. Commissions of the Committee 614
of the property to December 31st, 1926, $2,094.40. Income tax $24,269.96. Items of payments of accrued income on the purchase of securities and miscellaneous expenses, including attorney's fees, $3,860.31, making a total of $58,413.21

Q. What was the balance of the surplus income for the year 1926? A. $94,856.06.

Q. Will you please state the amount of income received by the Committee during the year 1927? A. $426,639.28.

Q. Will you please state the expenditures for that year? A. $278,615.55, composed of items as follows: Payments made pursuant to a court order— 615

Q. Can you give the date of that order? A. January 14th, 1927. $83,116.67.

Mr. Smyth: What was that for?

The Witness: These payments were—

Mr. Montgomery: Would you mind asking that after he gets these things through?

Mr. Smyth: All right.

A. (Continued) Payments for personal maintenance of the incompetent $16,712.23. Maintenance of real property

616 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

$23,149.25. Income taxes $136,474.34. Commissions to the Committee of the property $5,554.01. Payments for accrued interest on the purchase of securities and other miscellaneous expenses $13,609.05. Total $278,615.55

Q. Will you please state the balance of the surplus income received that remained in the hands of the Committee that year? A. $148,023.73.

Q. Will you please state the amount of income received by the Committee during the year 1928? A. $453,588.60.

Q. Will you please state the payments made out of the
617 income for that year? A. $269,683.40 in items as follows: Payments made pursuant to the court order January 14th, 1927, $136,250. Personal maintenance of the incompetent $15,621.72. Maintenance, real property, $25,064.02. Income taxes $75,936.83. Payments for accrued interest on purchase of securities and other miscellaneous expenses $9,987.20. Commissions to the Committee of the property $6,823.63. Total of $269,683.40.

Q. What was the surplus of the 1928 income left in your hands at the end of the year? A. $183,902.20.

Q. Will you please state the amount of income received by the Committee during the year 1929? A. $431,749.49.

618 Q. Will you please state the payments made during that year? A. $259,829.86 made up as follows: Payments pursuant to the court order of January 14th, 1927, $109,000. Personal maintenance of the incompetent $20,162.97. Maintenance of real property $36,302.48. Income taxes $85,023.62. Payments for accrued interest for the purchase of securities and miscellaneous expenses $2,179.03. Commissions to the Committee of the property $7,161.76, making a total of $259,829.86.

Q. Will you please state the surplus income for the year 1929 remaining in the hands of the Committee at the end of that year? A. $171,919.63.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

619

Q. Will you please state the amount of income received by the Committee during the year 1930? A. $447,202.06.

Q. Will you please state the payments made out of the income for that year? A. $235,921.36 made up as follows: Payments, pursuant to the court order of January 14th, 1927, $109,000. Personal maintenance of the incompetent $17,073.41. Maintenance of real property $27,112.79. Income taxes $67,635.27. Payments for accrued interest on the purchase of securities, miscellaneous expense, $8,220.52. Commissions to the Committee of the property $6,879.37. Making a total of $235,921.36.

620

Q. Will you please state what was the balance of surplus income for that year remaining in your hands at the end of the year? A. $211,280.70.

Q. Will you please state the amount of income received by the Committee during the year 1931? A. $460,183.62.

Q. Will you please state the payments made during that year out of income? A. $219,087.38 in items as follows: Payments made pursuant to the court order of January 14th, 1927, $109,000. Personal maintenance of the incompetent $17,716.18. Maintenance of real property $21,111.31. Income taxes $65,603.05. Payments for accrued interest in the purchase of securities and miscellaneous expenses $5,656.84. Making a total of $219,087.38.

621

Q. Will you please state the amount of surplus income for that year remaining in the hands of the Committee the end of the year? A. $241,096.24.

Q. Will you please state the total amount of the surplus income now in the possession of the Committee which had accumulated during the years 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930 and 1931? A. $1,051,078.56.

Q. Is the surplus income which accumulated during those years invested? A. Yes, sir, with the exception of a small cash balance.

622 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Cross Examination by Mr. Smyth:

Q. Mr. Murray, you say there is $954,000 in the capital account as of December 31st, 1931? A. Yes, sir.

Q. That $954,000, is that a book value? A. It is the inventory value, yes, sir.

Q. It is the inventory value. I suppose you don't know the inventory value of the 1st of this month? A. You mean the present value?

Q. What the inventory value is as of the 1st of May,
623 you don't know such a figure? A. Not on the principal, no, sir. I have an approximation of income.

Q. Well, now, this $954,000, that represents the figure at which you took over the securities? A. This amount represents the present balance of principal remaining in our hands on December 31st, 1931, after certain changes in principal had been made as the result of sale of securities, some payments necessarily chargeable against the principal.

Q. Well, could you say roughly what proportion of that $954,000 represents changes? A. I don't think I quite understand your question, Mr. Smyth.

624 Q. Is the great bulk of this $954,000, is that in the same securities which were taken over by the City Bank-Farmers Trust Company in 1926? A. No, it is not in the same securities. Changes were made from time to time. I think there are a few of the original securities now remaining on hand. There have been several changes from time to time.

Q. Will you say there are only a few of the original securities? A. It would be a little bit difficult to say exactly. I would have to refer to the annual inventories and accounts to show the changes.

Q. Let me put it this way: This $954,000, that does not represent market value today or as of December 31st,

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

1931? A. No, sir; it represents inventory value in this case. 625

By the Referee:

Q. Do you know what the market value of these securities are? A. Not of the principal, sir, offhand.

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. Can you ascertain for us that market value? A. Yes.
Q. I mean it is mostly quotations that you can readily obtain? A. Yes. 626

By the Referee:

Q. Are there any mortgages in that? A. Yes, sir, there is.
Q. Do you know the proportion of mortgages?

Mr. King: Do the annual accounts from year to year reflect the inventories of the current year?
The Witness: Yes.
Mr. King: Those have been offered in evidence, as I understand it, have they not? 627
Mr. Angulo: They appear to be in evidence.
Mr. King: So the comparison of the inventory of these annual accounts would reflect such changes have been made, and would also reflect the composition at the time the Farmers Loan & Trust Company received it?
The Witness: Correct.
Mr. King: And at the present time?
The Witness: Yes, sir.
The Referee: Will you answer my question?

628 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

The Witness: I am afraid I would have to add these up on an adding machine.

The Referee: Roughly speaking?

The Witness: I should say mortgages would make up perhaps one-fifth of the principal.

The Referee: Mortgages on New York City real estate?

The Witness: Yes, sir.

The Referee: Are they guaranteed mortgages?

The Witness: I couldn't say. I can determine
629 that for you, if you like.

Mr. Peabody: Are you sure it is one-fifth? Aren't you wrong in that proportion? The principal was largely invested in mortgages. Are any of those mortgages in defaults?

The Witness: No, sir.

The Referee: Go ahead, Mr. Smyth.

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. Well, can you get up a statement then of the market value of this estate as of the present date? A. Yes.

Q. And you understand that you carry on an arrive
630 at this figure of $954,000 from money securities that were bought before the depression? A. That is right.

Q. What I want to get at is what the approximate real value of the estate is at the present time. A. As at the present time?

Q. Now, these mortgages, I take it, are all legal for trustees of that type under the New York law? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you have no defaults on any of the mortgages? A. Not up to the present time.

Q. Any defaults on bonds? A. I know of none, sir. I am pretty sure that all of the bonds are paying their interest.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

631

Q. What is the income to the incompetent, approximately, on this $954,000 principal? A. I really couldn't say, Mr. Smyth. It is a difficult question to answer.

Q. You do not start your income from the estate of the incompetent and take one figure as income from these accumulated surplus, and one figure from the capital account which is now $954,000? A. No, sir. That all would have to be figured out to determine what the principal is.

Q. What is the income from the principal and accumulated surplus at the present time, as of December 31st, 1931?

632

Mr. Montgomery: Do you think it is necessary to get that? That would take quite a long while. They would have to calculate all income from the particular securities. Now, that $1,150,000 is all accumulated income. $954,000 represents what they received at the time they were appointed, so could this $2,000,000.

Mr. Smyth: Hasn't he got there what was the income on that approximately $2,000,000 for the year 1931?

Mr. Montgomery: He has given you all that. He has testified what the total income was. He 633
did not testify separately, because that would mean—

Mr. Angulo: He has the figure that Mr. Smyth wants, if I may interrupt. He can give you that figure.

The Witness: $460,183.02.

Q. That is not the total? A. Do you want the figure income received other than that from the Houghton tate?

Mr. Smyth: That is right.

634 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Mr. Montgomery: He can give you that.
The Witness: For 1931, $77,412.78.

Q. Who is the trustee of the Houghton estate? A. City Bank-Farmers Trust Company.

Q. Your own company? A. Yes.

Q. Now, then, the income from the Houghton estate was then for 1931 the difference between $77,000 and the $461,000? A. That is right. I will give you the exact figure.

Q. All right. A. It is $382,770.84.

635 Q. Now, has the income from the Houghton estate diminished at all in 1931 as against 1930? A. It shows an increase, sir.

Q. It shows an increase? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Of how much? A. 1930 income was $378,016.09.

Q. Is the Houghton estate invested in all legal investments for trustees? A. No, sir.

Q. Is the principal source of that income from a stock? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has that rate of dividend been increased or has it been stationary? A. There has been a decrease in a recent cut in dividends, since April 1st of this year.

636 Q. Could you tell me what the old dividend was, and what the present dividend is? A. Up to April, the dividend of the common stock of the Corning Glass was 62-½ cents; the dividend paid in May was paid at the rate of 56-¼ cents per share.

Q. That is roughly a 10 per cent cut in the dividend? A. A little bit less; just slightly less.

Q. So that that would only affect the income if this dividend was continued to the extent of about $38,000, the income from the Houghton estate? A. No, it would not be as much as that.

Q. Because there are other investments in the estate besides the stock, is that what you mean? A. The actual

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

637

decrease in the amount of the income from this common stock would be $22,680 at the new dividend rate.

Q. So that if you take the income as $382,000 for 1931, which is the figure you gave me, with the cut in the dividend if it was in operation all year, the diminution in income would only bring the income down to around $360,000? A. That is right.

Q. Could you tell me what proportion of the Houghton estate is in legal investments, and how much is in common stock? A. I don't think I can from memory, Mr. Smyth.

638

Mr. Angulo: I might say, the difficulty would be in determining the value of the Corning Glass stock. It is only carried at an inventory value, at a very small sum. We could give you a list of the securities.

Mr. Smyth: What I would like to get is what income would come in from the Houghton estate in case a dividend was passed entirely on this common stock.

Mr. Angulo: We can supply that, of course. I know it would be comparatively a small sum. The bulk of the estate, of course, is the Corning Glass, but we will furnish that.

639

Mr. Smyth: I was trying to get at what assured income there was.

Mr. Angulo: Could we give it to you this way: I think Mr. Murray has the figures of the dividends received from the Corning Glass Works for the year 1931.

Mr. Smyth: Is that the only stock in the estate?

Mr. Angulo: Yes.

Mr. Smyth: Then, that would be all right if you could give me that.

Mr. King: Could he give it for a period of years, since the appointment of the Committee?

640 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

The Witness: I could not do that, Mr. Angulo. I would prefer to prepare a statement showing the income.

Mr. Angulo: You have it for 1931, though?

The Witness: The income on the common stock, Corning Glass Works, during 1931 was at the rate of 62-½ cents per share on 30,240 shares. This approximated $226,800.

Mr. Smyth: So that the dividends—

Mr. Angulo: And then, on the preferred?

641 The Witness: On the preferred stock, the dividend was at the rate of 1-¼ per cent each quarter, which amounted to $22,680 quarterly, or $90,720 for the year. That dividend remains unchanged.

Q. Do I understand it to be correct that approximately $316,000 out of the $382,000 received from the Houghton estate is the proceeds of dividends from stock? A. That is right.

Q. And that leaves a balance of approximately $60,000 or a little more income other than that received from the stock in the Corning Glass? A. Yes, sir.

642 Q. Now, then, that $60,000, is that income derived from investments legal for trustees? A. Yes, sir.

Q. In New York State? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you are quite sure that all that balance then, besides the stock comes from investments that are legal for trustees? A. I am pretty sure that the other investments, outside of Corning Glass Works, are legal. I won't be sure. I would have to consult the record. I do not happen to handle the Houghton estate, and I would prefer to consult the record.

Q. Would you testify that substantially all that balance comes from legal investments? A. I am of the opinion.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

643

I have not looked at the securities for some time now in the Houghton estate.

Q. What is this real estate in your disbursements each year as a maintenance charge? Take the year 1927. I think that is the first year, what was spent for real estate?

Mr. Montgomary: He has already testified to that.

Mr. Smyth: Yes, I know. I just want to get a figure. A. $23,149.25.

644 Q. And is it approximately that figure each year? A. It is approximately that, with the exception of one year, we had some additional expense.

Q. What is that $23,000 spent for? You say real estate. How is it spent, and what is it spent for? A. For the maintenance of the homestead which is in Geneva New York, and an estate at Palm Beach.

Q. Does the Committee maintain a home for the incompetent in Geneva, New York? A. We keep up the property at Geneva, New York.

Q. What is that property, Mrs. Vail's home? A. That is right.

645 Q. Who lives there, anybody? A. They have a staff up there to take care of the property, a caretaker and assistants.

Q. Is it a large place? A. I believe it is. I have never seen the property.

Q. It is not rented out; there is no income? A. No, not that I know of.

The Referee: It is where the Houghton family came from, is it not, at Geneva, New York?

The Witness: I believe it is, yes, sir.

Q. Is this property a home, a winter home down in Palm Beach? A. That is right.

646 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Q. Does anybody occupy that? A. There are caretakers.

Q. It is not rented out? You get no income? A. No, sir.

Q. Even before the depression?

Mr. King: You have not rented it?
The Witness: Not at the present time.
Mr. King: One year you did?
The Witness: Not at the present time.

647 Q. It is proper that you have tried to rent it and have rented it in the past? A. That is right.

Q. And you are trying to rent that, then at the present time—well, I mean during the season you tried to rent it? A. That I could not say offhand, Mr. Smyth.

Mr. King: I think I can answer that. I have had correspondence with the trust company. They are trying to sell it, and they have been constantly trying to rent it.

Q. And you are trying to dispose of that property in
648 Palm Beach? A. Yes, sir, we are. We have made several attempts to do that.

Q. You have no policy at all of holding on to that property? A. No, we do not intend to hold on to that.

Q. That is the Palm Beach property? A. That is right.

Q. How much does that cost a year, approximately? A. I couldn't say, but I should think the greater part of the real estate expense went for the support of the property down there.

Mr. Angulo: Mr. Smyth can look at the account if that will give him the answer.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

649

Q. Can you look at the account and tell me how much you spent for the maintenance of the Palm Beach piece, and how much approximately for the Geneva? A. I couldn't tell that, because there are so many items paid out during the year for the maintenance of both pieces of property, that it would all have to be segregated in order for me to reach a figure showing the charge for the benefit of the Florida property

Q. Is the Trust Company trying at all to dispose of the Geneva property? A. No, we are not trying to dispose of that property.

650

Q. And you think the greater portion of this expenditure is on the Palm Beach property? A. Yes, sir, that is right.

Q. Would you say roughly how much? A. I prefer not to say from memory, Mr. Smyth. I will be very glad to get the figures for you if you desire.

Mr. Montgomery: You do not want him to get that, do you, Mr. Smyth? I mean it is spent, and I do not see that it makes much difference whether spent on the Geneva property or the Palm Beach property.

651

Mr. Peabody: I think these inventories are on the record, and we can supply you with copies of them, and from that there are payments day by day, and it can be taken off from that, and he can do it from these annual inventories which shows the amount.

Mr. Smyth: I do not think that is necessary. I mean the figure is there, what is spent for the maintenance of this real property, from which there is no income, and that is practically a fixed charge against the incompetent's estate each year, from which there is very little hope of ever getting any

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

652 income to offset it, unless there is rental some day at Palm Beach.

Mr. Peabody: They have had an offer to sell it, and I think they are negotiating with a man down there who has made an offer which is a little low, and they are hoping to get him up. I think they may be able to get rid of that Palm Beach property. Within the last month or so there has been an offer.

653 Q. As I understand it, no one gets any benefit out of either of those estates? It is just an expense to the incompetent's estate? A. That is right.

Q. I would like very much to know what the market value is of the incompetent's estate for some current date that you yourself would want to pick out. A. I could give you an approximation at the present time on the income securities, but I haven't got it on the principal.

Mr. Peabody: Could not the Trust Company provide that to the special guardian?

Mr. Angulo: Surely, we will supply that.

Mr. Smyth: That is just what I would like to

654 have.

Mr. Angulo: Yes, sir, surely.

Q. You say there is no mortgages in default, and that there are no bonds in default? A. No, but what I was referring to particularly, Mr. Smyth, was the fact that you wanted to know how much the yield on the various securities were, and having in mind that you asked for this statement, I could include that in there, easily.

Q. You have given me the figure of $77,000 from the incompetent's estate? A. That is right. I thought I could give you the figures of the yield of all the securities

that you could have at the same time the statement was made up.

Mr. Montgomery: That $77,000 includes income from invested surplus income.

Mr. Smyth: Yes. Then, I would like to know what the income is from the principal of the estate.

The Witness: Yes, I can show that on this statement.

Mr. Smyth: So it will break it up and show what the income is from the principal of the incompetent's estate, and what the market value is of the principal, and what the market value is of this accumulated surplus, because the figure of $1,051,000 —is that the figure for the— 656

Mr. Montgomery: That is accumulated income.

The Witness: That is right.

Q. That $1,051,000 is another inventory figure? A. That is right.

Q. Such as you use when you make up annual accounts. If you got a security in 1928 you would carry it at the 1928 value if you have not sold it? A. That is right.

Q. And it may be greatly depreciated in market value, but it would not show in your report except in a few instances where you have changed the security? A. That is right. 657

Mr. Angulo: He can give you that figure now.

The Witness: I have an approximation of the valuation of the income securities.

Mr. Peabody: That is accumulated income. He can give you the market value of that.

Q. The market value of the accumulated income which

658 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

is $1,051,000, you can give me the market value of that at the present time? A. That is right.

Q. All right, I would like to know that. A. This value is not absolutely accurate.

Q. You are going to give me an accurate value in the statement? A. That is $907,277.69, making an approximate net difference of $143,800.

The Referee: I understand that is invested in New York City first mortgages and various Municipal and State bonds, is that correct, that $907,000?

659 The Witness: Yes, there may be some other bonds in here outside of Municipal and State bonds, but I don't think there are. You are correct, Mr. Morgan.

Q. You do not know how much is invested of that in mortgages and how much in bonds, do you? A. I haven't got the exact figure on the mortgages. I can run it off here and give you a figure.

Q. Now, you have charge of this estate in the City Bank-Farmers Trust Company? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever seen this incompetent? A. No, I
660 have not.

Q. You have never been up to MacDonald's House? A. No, sir.

Q. And do you know if anybody from the City Bank-Farmers Trust Company who has gone up there? A. Yes, there have been officers of the bank to see Mrs. Vail. I could not give you the exact date.

Q. When they have seen her, do you mean they have seen her up there in MacDonald's House? A. I believe so; I would not be sure.

Q. Do you know who those officers are? A. No, I can't say that I do offhand, Mr. Smyth.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

661

Mr. Smyth: Do you know who they are, Mr. Angulo?

Mr. Angulo: Mr. Peabody is the attorney for this estate.

Mr. Peabody: I do not know. I could not say who has been there or when.

(Discussion off the record.)

The Referee: Have you any more questions, Mr. Smyth?

Mr. Smyth: No, I have no more questions.

The Referee: Mr. Murray, you will see to it 662
that those bits of information that the special guardian has asked be furnished to him as quickly as you can.

The Witness: Yes, I will. It will take some little time to prepare the market value and income, inasmuch as there are so many municipalities in the account, that it will take some time to obtain the values on them.

Mr. Smyth: I do not want you to waste too much time on the income. That is in a lump sum that I have here already. I am interested in, of course, what the real market value is of these securities. 663

Mr. Montgomery: You mean the securities in the principal?

Mr. Smyth: Yes.

Mr. Montgomery: But they are not going to dispose of those in this application. Those will still remain in the estate.

Mr. Smyth: That is true, but I want to be sure there is real money in the estate after this money is taken out.

The Referee: Before you let the accumulated income go out.

664 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Mr. Smyth: Why, certainly.

Mr. Peabody: I think he is entitled to that, but how far you want to itemize that—

Mr. Smyth: I do not want it in any more detail. I just want to know what the real value is as distinguished from this inventory value. Now, for instance, in the inventory value of the accumulated surplus it is down as $150,000. I want to know if money is taken from that accumulated surplus, is there plenty of principal there.

665 Mr. Montgomery: I think that is reasonable.

Mr. Smyth: Left to take care of this incompetent.

Mr. Montgomery: I think that is reasonable.

The Referee: That would not take such a long time to get, would it, Mr. Murray?

The Witness: No, sir, I have a simple statement here which has not been filled in in its run-off, without values on it. This shows items of income and investments. They are all marked with their yield. Would this statement satisfy you, Mr. Smyth, a statement of this nature? It

666 goes through all securities and shows which is principal and which is income.

Mr. Peabody: My understanding is that Mr. Smyth would be satisfied with a statement similar to the one you have given in regard to the accumulated income.

(Discussion off the record.)

The Referee: That would not take long?

The Witness: No, sir.

The Referee: Will you do that as soon as you can?

The Witness: Yes, sir.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

667

Cross Examination by Mr. King:

Q. Mr. Murray, I want to ask you one or two questions particularly with regard to the inventory which has been mentioned as $954,000. A. Yes.

Q. For many years the Farmers Loan and Trust Company was the executor and trustee under the will of Charles F. Houghton? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And a life beneficiary of that estate was Mrs. Vail? A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the time of her incompetency there was in your hands as custodian for her or as beneficiary of this will 668
of Charles F. Houghton, this amount of money which has been referred to as $954,000, isn't that right? A. The inventory of that property was a little bit higher than that. I think I have testified to it some time ago.

Q. And do you know what the origin of that $954,000 was, generally? A. That constituted property that was originally taken over by the Committee and treated as principal, and as set forth more particularly in this 1926 annual inventory and account in Schedule A.

Q. Can you tell me whether or not that $954,000 itself represented accumulated income in the hands of Mrs. Vail from the estate of Houghton? A. Part of it did, 669
yes, sir.

Q. When you say part of it, do you mean to a large extent? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And so practically all of that $954,000 was from income? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have no hesitancy in saying that? A. After examination of Schedule A in the 1926 account, it is quite apparent that is the situation.

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. In this $954,000, is this Palm Beach and Geneva

670 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

real estate included, or is that in the $1,051,000 figure, the accumulated surplus? A. That property—

Mr. Peabody: I made up these accounts, so I am familiar with it somewhat, and Mr. Murray does not recall the $956,000 is personal property. The real estate is carried as an appraised value and does not appear.

Mr. Smyth: The real estate is not the $954,000 figure at all.

671 Mr. Peabody: That is my understanding.

The Witness: That is right: it is not included.

Q. It is not included in the $954,000 at all? A. Although it is carried on our records at the appraised value.

Mr. Peabody: And it does not appear in the total?

The Witness: No.

Mr. Smyth: Can you state what the two pieces of real estate are carried at?

Mr. Peabody: I can give you that.

672 The Witness: All right, sir, thank you. The appraised value of the property at Geneva, New York, is $45,275. The property at Palm Beach is appraised at $196,274.25.

Mr. Smyth: I have no further questions of this witness, Mr. Referee.

WARREN L. MURRAY

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 19th day of May, 1932.

TOWNSEND MORGAN
Referee

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

MaBelle Houghton Plumb, called as a witness, first being duly sworn, testified as follows: 673

By the Referee:

Q. What is your full name? A. MaBelle Houghton Plumb.

Q. Where do you live, Mrs. Plumb? A. Geneva, New York.

Q. That is your residence? A. Yes. I have not been there very much.

Q. But that is where you pay your taxes from, and that is your official residence? A. Yes. 674

Direct Examination by Mr. Montgomery:

Q. Mrs. Plumb, you are the daughter, are you not, of Mrs. Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent? A. I am.

Q. And how many times was Mrs. Vail married? A. Twice.

Q. Please give us the name of her first husband. A. Charles Frederick Houghton.

Q. How many children did she have by that marriage? A. Three.

Q. Will you please give their names and state whether they are alive or not? A. Laura Houghton, deceased, Florence Houghton, deceased, and myself MaBelle Houghton Plumb 675

Q. Florence Houghton died in infancy, did she not? A. Yes.

Q. And Laura Houghton married? A. She did, yes.

Q. Whom did she marry? A. Ieuan Harris.

Q. And she died about when A. On August 31st, [illegible].

Q. And did she leave any children? A. Three sons.

676 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Q. Will you please give their names and their ages, if you can? A. John Houghton Harris, he is sixteen, William Reese Harris, fourteen, and David Farnum Harris, twelve.

Q. Have you any children? A. One son.

Q. What is his name, please? A. Joseph Hudson Plumb, Jr.

Q. How old is he, Mrs. Plumb? A. Nineteen.

Q. Did your mother marry after your father's death? A. She did, yes.

677 Q. Whom did she marry? A. Dr. Charles Delamater Vail.

Q. Is he alive? A. No.

Q. And do you know when he died, Mrs. Plumb? A. He died in the summer of 1923.

Q. Were there any children by that marriage? A. None.

Q. Do you know whether the children, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris have a guardian? A. They have, yes.

Q. Who is he? A. Their father, Ieuan Harris.

Q. And he is still alive? A. Yes.

Q. And is their guardian? A. Yes.

678 Q. Is your son attending school? A. He is in boarding school.

Q. When does he go to college? A. We hope next year.

Q. Will you please state what the relationships were between your mother, your sister and yourself, and her three grandchildren prior to the time she became ill? A. We were always a very affectionate and united family.

Q. Did you live with her at the time of your marriage? A. I did.

Q. And your sister also? A. Yes.

Q. Did your mother make any gift to you or your

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

679

sister that you can remember? A. Yes, she did; some rather large sums.

Q. Are you receiving any allowance from the estate of your mother? A. Yes, I am.

Q. Will you please state the amount? A. $50,000 a year.

Q. And is Mr. Harris, as guardian of your sister's children, receiving the same amount? A. Yes, as far as I know.

Q. Have you any resources of your own, Mrs. Plumb, outside of that allowance? A. A small amount that comes from the estate of my father's sister, about $300 a year from that.

680

Q. That is, you get $300 A. Approximately that.

Q. And your sister's children get the other $300? A. Yes.

Q. Your living expenses, due to the age of your son and the fact of his preparation for college, going to college, will be considerably increased, will they not? A. Oh, very much so, yes.

Q. In your opinion, is $50,000 a year that you receive from your mother's estate sufficient to maintain you, yourself and your son in the manner in which your position entitles you to, and also to send him through college and educate him in the manner in which his position entitles him to be educated? A. Not entirely.

681

Q. Mrs. Plumb, have you visited your mother up at Dr. MacDonald's House? A. Yes, very often.

Q. Will you please describe the place, and also the quarters which your mother has there"? A. Well, there are about 200 acres of very beautiful grounds around the buildings. There are a number of buildings all well equipped, nicely furnished, well heated, and there is luxury and comfort there. My mother has three rooms, her sitting room and her bedroom which we have fur-

682 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

nished for her, and one room which is sunnier than the others in which she sits part of the time. She likes to have the nurses in there. I took that third room for her because she did not like to have the nurses with her constantly.

Q. Does she have the use of an automobile whenever she wants? A. Yes, she has the use of an automobile.

Q. And did you have any meals there? A. Yes. I have luncheon every time I go up to see her.

Q. How are the meals? A. Delicious.

683 Q. Are they just as good as she would have in her own home? A. Yes, I should say so.

Q. Are the quarters which she occupies as roomy and as well furnished as it is possible under the circumstances? A. Yes, decidedly.

Q. In your opinion, is she receiving everything that she could possibly receive under the circumstances, considering the amount of her property and her income? A. I have done everything for her that I could possibly think of and that anybody else can suggest for me to do for her in every way.

Q. The doctor testified that sometimes they made sug-
684 gestions as to what might be brought for her comfort and pleasure? A. Yes.

Q. And have you always followed out those suggestions? A. In every way.

Q. In fact, you have, as he stated, supplied more than he felt was necessary? A. Every time I go to see my mother I have asked both the doctors that I see there if there is anything they thought of since I was last there that would add to her comfort and happiness, and I always accept their suggestion in every way.

Q. And if they make a suggestion you see that that article or thing is supplied? A. Yes, indeed.

Q. Have you had any contact with the nurses which

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

your mother has? A. Yes, I have made it my business to talk with them. 685

Q. Are they pleasant and agreeable people? A. Yes, they are. Dr. Pilgrim has splendid nurses up there.

Q. Is that on high ground? A. Yes, very, on the side of a small mountain there.

Q. Is not the whole institution more like a luxurious country club than it is a sanitarium? A. Yes, I should think so. I was very much surprised to find out how nicely they could do things in a place of that kind.

Q. The grounds are kept in beautiful order? A. Like a park they are. Mother sees beautiful flower beds and beautiful lawns and trees from her rooms, a lovely view. 686

Q. There is no place that you know of that you would rather have your mother than that? A. No.

Q. From her appearance is she happy and contented there as much as possible under the circumstances? A. Yes, I should think so. She has been in such a state of mental confusion that it is difficult to tell what her reactions are, but I know she is comfortable.

Q. During the time that your mother was well, and until you noticed that something was happening to her, she was always generous and affectionate and kind to you and your sister when she was alive, and the three grandchildren, the children of your sister, until she became afflicted with this disease? A. Very much so. 687

By the Referee:

Q. During the time that your mother was in good health, did she ever make you any substantial gifts of money? A. Yes, she did, Mr. Morgan.

Q. You consider a substantial gift, I assume around $20,000 or $25,000? A. She gave me at one time $30,000 to buy a house, and another time a check for $10,000 when I started for Australia.

688 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Q. And she always evidenced a very kindly feeling for you, an affectionate feeling? A. Yes, indeed she did.

Q. Would you say it was a great affection? A. Yes, I would.

Q. And when she was normal, an affectionate feeling toward your son? A. Yes, she was devoted to my son.

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. And also to the three other grandchildren? A. Very
689 proud of her grandsons. I never saw a prouder grandmother.

Q. Those gifts that you speak of, are not the only gifts that your mother gave you? A. No.

Cross Examination by Mr. King:

Q. Mrs. Plumb, may I ask how old you are? A. Forty-nine years old.

Q. Mrs. Plumb, how long have you been married? A. Twenty years this June.

Q. Previous to your marriage, you lived at home with your mother? A. I did.

690 Q. And up until that time your sister Laura was alive? A. She was, yes.

Q. You and your mother and your sister Laura lived together, isn't that so? A. Yes.

Q. And your family life at that time was characterized by a good deal of luxuries, was it not? A. Yes, very much so.

Q. First you lived at Corning, New York, is that true? A. Yes, I was born there.

Q. Then you went to live at Geneva? A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall that date, roughly? A. I was born in 1883. I was 17 years old when I went there to live.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

691

Q. At that time you went to boarding school? A. Yes.

Q. And that was one of the more fashionable boarding schools at New York City? A. Supposed to be.

Q. Your sister went there too, isn't that true? A. Yes, sir.

The Referee: What was the name of that school?

Mr. King: Mrs. Hazen's School. It is out of business now.

The Referee: Was it Mrs. Hazen's School?

The Witness: Yes, but it is no longer in existence.

692

Q. During that period of time your mother gave you every advantage, social and educational, did she not? A. Yes, she did.

Q. Did your life at that time include travelling abroad? A. Yes.

Q. Did it include a trip around the world? A. Yes.

Q. And that occupied nearly a year, isn't that so? A. About a year and a half.

Q. That trip was characterized by a great deal of luxury? A. Yes, everything possible was done to make it comfortable and pleasant.

693

Q. Your mother paid entirely for that trip, did she not? A. Yes.

Q. Did that include a visit to Egypt? A. Yes.

Q. To China? A. Yes.

Q. To Japan? A. Yes.

Q. All the various countries which she thought was of interest? A. Yes.

Q. Your sister accompanied you on that trip? A. Yes.

Q. So there were three in the party? A. Four.

Q. All those expenses were borne by your mother? A. Yes.

694 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Q. Was she liberal in making allowances to you and your sister? A. Yes.

Q. Was there an equality in the way in which she treated you two sisters? A. Yes, decidedly so.

Q. What she would do for one she would do for the other? A. Yes.

Q. Did she ever make presents of expensive jewelry? A. Yes, many of them.

Q. I think you referred to the fact that she gave you a house which was of the value of $30,000, is that cor-
695 rect? A. Yes.

Q. Did she make a corresponding gift to your sister? A. She did; she gave her some property in Geneva.

Q. Your home in Geneva was spacious? A. Yes.

Q. It required a number of servants to keep it up? A. Yes.

Q. Generally speaking, you say the surroundings in which you were brought up were luxurious? A. I think they were.

Q. Previous to the time you were married she was making you an allowance of $5,000 a year? A. Yes.

Q. Am I correct in remembering your previous testi-
696 mony to the effect that that was increased to $6,000 a year? A. Yes, she raised it the last two years to $6,000.

Q. Did she make the same increase in the case of your sister? A. Yes.

Q. So that each of you received $6,000 a year? A. Yes.

Q. Was that first motivated by your marriage? A. No.

Q. Was it motivated at all by the fact of your sister's marriage? A. No.

Q. So up until the time of Mrs. Vail's incompetency, why, you each had an allowance of $6,000 a year? A. Yes.

Q. That was irrespective of any other resources which either of you had, is that so? A. Yes.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

697

Q. Did you know as a matter of family knowledge whether or not your mother had any resources independently of what accrued to her from your father by your father's death? A. I know of none.

Q. So all of the family substance was derived from your father, is that so? A. Yes.

Q. Your mother had no independent means of her own? A. No.

Q. Since your mother's adjudication of incompetency you have made a thorough search for a will, have you not? A. I have, yes.

698

Q. You have inquired among the lawyers who you knew your mother employed whether or not they had ever drawn a will for her? A. I have never been able to find any.

Q. There was never any response to those inquiries? A. No. Anybody we asked said they knew nothing about any will that mother had ever made.

Q. Do you know whether or not your mother's last lawyer who represented her in various matters concerning your father's estate was Chief Justice Hughes? A. Yes, he was.

Q. I believe you testified on the last hearing that an inquiry had been made of Judge Hughes and of his son as to whether or not either of them had ever drawn a will? A. I believe that to be so, but I did not make that inquiry myself.

699

Q. In any event, no will was ever forthcoming, to your knowledge? A. No.

By the Referee:

Q. And do you know what your mother's income was at the time she was making your sister and yourself an

700 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

allowance of $6,000 a year? A. No, Mr. Morgan, I do not know.

Q. But you do know as a matter of general knowledge that the income has materially increased since that time? A. I do know that, yes.

Q. That is, the income from this fund? A. Yes.

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. Who is the attorneys that you inquired about as to whether your mother had ever made a will besides
701 Mr. Justice Hughes? A. Well, we inquired at the Trust Company.

Q. To the City Bank-Farmers Trust Company? A. Yes.

Q. And did they deny— A. They knew nothing of it.

Q. They knew nothing of it? A. They knew nothing of it.

Q. They never heard of a will? A. No.

Q. Did you ask them if a will was ever filed with them? A. I did, yes.

Q. Your mother lived in Geneva? A. Yes.

Q. Did she have an attorney there? A. Yes, there were two attorneys there.

702 Q. What were their names, do you remember? A. Mr. L. G. Hoskin, and a Mr. O'Brien, and we asked both of them and they knew nothing about it.

Q. You say "we", you mean you personally? A. Yes.

Q. And they never heard of a will? A. They never heard of a will.

Q. Had they said your mother had never discussed with them the drawing of a will? A. No, I do not think anything was ever said about that.

Mr. King: W. Smith O'Brien is the name of that gentleman?

The Witness: W. Smith O'Brien. Thank you.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

703

Q. And both those attorneys in Geneva said they knew nothing of the will? A. Both attorneys in Geneva said they knew nothing of the will.

Q. And in New York were there other attorneys who represented your mother besides Mr. Hughes? A. Mr. Hughes and his son who did some work for mother at some time.

Q. I mean was he the only attorney? A. So far as I know. She did not always discuss her affairs with me.

Q. But they were the only attorneys that you knew of and you asked them? A. Yes.

704

Q. And they said they knew of no will? A. Yes, they said they knew of no will.

Q. How often do you go up to Dr. MacDonald's house? A. Well, my visits up there vary. Last year I was in the hospital very ill, and I didn't get up there for three or four months. I tried, in the beginning, to get up there regularly every six weeks, but Dr. Pilgrim said that it upsets my mother to have me come in,—any visitors distressed her, and he said he thought it better if I did not come quite so often. He said it would make it easier for them and easier for everybody, but I have always access to her any time of day or night. Now, I

705

try to go up about every seven or eight weeks, and I receive a written report weekly from the doctors.

Q. You stated that you have eaten there yourself? A. Yes, every time I go there I have a delicious luncheon.

Q. And the food is really high class? A. Yes, I should think so.

Q. And you are the one who is consulted about the number of nurses? I mean they are employed under your direction? A. Well, Dr. Pilgrim and I together, consult each other, and I like to know what he thinks is right for my mother.

Q. He consults you before a nurse would be hired?

706 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

A. Oh, no. He would consult me as to whether my mother should have one or two or three nurses, but he occasionally changes the nurses, without anything being said to me.

Q. I do not mean anything about the changes. And your mother has three nurses, two day and one night? A. Yes.

Q. You know that of your own knowledge? A. Yes, I see them every time I am there.

Q. And you see them actually in attendance? A. Oh,
707 yes. They are always there when I go there. I had an understanding with Dr. Pilgrim that my mother was never to be left alone.

Q. They do not take care of any other patients besides your mother? A. No, absolutely not. They devote their entire time to her.

Q. How many doctors are there up there? A. Well, Dr. Pilgrim is the senior doctor and Dr. Neumann who was here today is his son-in-law, and Dr. MacDonald, those three have been there since my mother was taken there, and there is a new doctor whom I have not met, who came in the last two or three months.

708 Q. Isn't Dr. McDonald dead?" A. The founder of this institution is dead, and this Dr. MacDonald is no relation. It is just a coincidence that his name is the same.

Q. Do you know whether these doctors are specialists in mental diseases? A. Yes.

Q. And did you ever make any inquiry as to their standing and ability? A. Well, yes, when my mother was committed we made an exhaustive research up there. We did everything we could to find out whether it was a suitable place for her to be placed there.

Q. Did you ever have any outside alienist or doctors go to examine your mother? A. Yes. Before she was

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

committed she was looked over by ten alienists, altogether. 709

Q. I suppose all prominent in the profession? A. Yes; they brought in a unanimous verdict about her.

Q. Do you know from talking to the nurses and the doctors up there and to your mother that she gets the best of care? I mean, have you ever inquired as to that? A. Oh, yes, I make inquiries in every way, and I draw the nurses off aside every time I go up there and question them closely. I have the utmost confidence in Dr. Pilgrim; he has a very, very fine record; he is a very splendid man. 710

Q. When you say you lived at Geneva, did you live at this house that your mother owns? A. Yes, I have been up there for some time as guardian of her person, to look after her things up there. I go up and stay there for quite a length of time, from time to time. All those nice things up there have to be taken care of. We have a servant up there who has been with my mother 45 years, and he is the caretaker there, and has other men to help him. I go up to look the house over for moths, and have it aired and stay for some time.

By the Referee. 711

Q. Where do you live when you do not live at Geneva? A. We have a small home at Marion, Massachusetts. We went down there so the boy could be there in the summer. He is quite a sailor, and we wanted to be near the water.

Q. Have you an apartment here in New York? A. No.

(Short recess taken.)

712 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

By Mr. King:

Q. Mrs. Plumb, how old were you when your father died? A. 12 years old.

Q. Were the relations between your father and mother entirely normal and affectionate? A. Yes, indeed.

Q. Was you mother devoted to your father? A. Yes.

Q. Did she ever express herself with a desire to carry out his wishes with regard to her daughters? A. Yes, I know she always tried to do that.

713 Q. And do you recall any specific conversations on the subject? A. Well, I don't think I do, no, except I know I heard her say a great many times she wanted to be mother and father both to her girls, and she tried to carry out my father's wishes in every way.

Q. She was, of course, familiar with the terms of your father's will? A. Oh, yes.

Q. At the time that will was made, how old was your sister? A. When the will was made?

Q. At the time of your father's death? A. My sister was 16 at the time of my father's death——

Q. At the time both of you were minors? A. Yes.

714 Mr. Smyth: Is the will in evidence?

Mr. Montgomery: Yes.

Mr. King: I intended to offer it in evidence.

Mr. Smyth: Just what I want to find out is whether it is among the papers we stipulated should be in evidence.

Mr. Montgomery: It is in evidence in the former proceeding.

The Referee: Why don't you, in order to be sure of the thing—we have not the will physically present, why not offer it in evidence now, and if

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

715

there is no objection, it is received. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. King: I will, if Mrs. Plumb's testimony is concluded.

The Referee: I do not know about that. Mr. Smyth, have you anything further?

Mr. Smyth: No.

The Referee: Mr. Angulo?

Mr. Angulo: No questions.

By the Referee:

716

Q. How old were you, if you can recall, when your father died? A. My father died in March, on March 29th, and I was 13 years old that April.

Q. And your sister was older than you? A. My sister was 4 years older than I. Her birthday was in May.

Q. Your father was always most affectionate to both your sister and you? A. Yes, indeed.

The Referee: Do you want to offer the will now?

Mr. King: Yes. I will offer in evidence a copy of the will of Charles F. Houghton, and codicil thereto. The will is dated December 20th, 1892, and the codicil is dated March 20th, 1893. 717

The Referee: Any objection?

Mr. Smyth: I have no objection.

Mr. King: I believe it is in the record on the former proceeding that this will was probated, and the Farmers Loan & Trust Company has ever since acted as executor and trustee thereunder.

(Will and codicil received in evidence and marked General Guardian Exhibit 1, of this date.)

718 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

MaBelle Houghton Plumb

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 16th day of May, 1932.

Eugene O'Dunne Jr
Notary Public
My commission expires December 29, 1938

Notarial certificate

719 Seal

Ieuan Harris, called as a witness, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

By the Referee:

Q. What is your full name? A. Ieuan Harris.
Q. Where do you live, Mr. Harris? A. Salisbury, Connecticut.

Direct Examination by Mr. King:

720

Q. Mr. Harris, until her death, were you the husband of Laura Houghton Harris? A. Yes.
Q. Was she a daughter of the incompetent, Helen H. Vail? A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember the date of death of Laura Houghton Harris? A. August 31, 1925.
Q. And thereafter, were you appointed general guardian for your children? A. Yes.
Q. I believe that you testified to that, did you not, in the former proceeding? A. Yes.
Q. At the—

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

721

Mr. King: At that time, your Honor, there was offered in evidence an exemplification of the record of Mr. Harris's appointment as general guardian. I would like to supplement that by offering in evidence the certificate of the Surrogate's Court of Ontario County, dated the 6th day of May, 1932, as to the fact that Mr. Harris is still acting as general guardian.

The Referee: Any objection?

Mr. Smyth: No objection.

722

(Received in evidence and marked General Guardian's Exhibit 2, of this date.)

Q. Will you tell me the name of your three children, and their ages? A. John Houghton, 16; William Reese, 14; David Farnum, 12.

Q. Until your wife's death, did you live at Geneva, New York? A. Yes.

Q. Did Mrs. Vail also live there? A. Yes.

Q. Did she know these children? A. Yes.

Q. What was her attitude with regard to them? A. Very proud of them.

Q. Did she visit them constantly? A. Very much. 723

Q. What was the relation between Mrs. Vail and your wife, Laura Houghton Harris? A. Mother and daughter.

Q. Everything was entirely agreeable? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was she familiar with your way of living? A. Who, Mrs. Vail?

Q. Yes? A. Yes.

Q. Was your married life characterized with a good deal of luxury? A. Yes, I should think so.

Q. You have traveled abroad? A. Yes.

Q. And conduct quite a large house? A. Yes.

Q. With quite a number of servants? A. Yes.

724 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Q. And with all those circumstances Mrs. Vail was familiar? A. Yes.

Q. You were never dependent upon her at any time for support or financial aid? A. No.

Q. Notwithstanding those circumstances did she make an allowance to her daughter? A. Yes.

Q. And do you recall what that was? A. $6000 a year.

Q. Was that continuous during your married life? A. I think it was $5,000 at one time, and increased to $6,000 the last comparatively few years.

725 Q. In addition to those sums do you know whether or not Mrs. Vail made presents to your wife? A. Yes, she gave us the house or gave my wife the house.

Q. Do you recall the approximate value of that? A. I think the assessed valuation is $27,000, at the moment. A good many gifts in the shape of jewelry, and on occasions like birthdays or Christmas, something of that kind, high holidays, as it were, a good sized gift.

The Referee: Of money?

The Witness: Yes, or a piece of jewelry.

726 Q. In giving you this house, do you know whether that was to equalize a corresponding gift to her daughter Marbelle? A. Well, I don't know; she may have had it in mind. I should think yes, having done the same to both.

Q. And do you know whether or not those two gifts were made approximately at the same time? A. I do not think I could answer that.

Mr. Montgomery: I think that has been testified to by Mrs. Plumb.

Mr. King: You think it is in the former record?

Mr. Montgomery: It has been testified to today by Mrs. Plumb.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

727

Q. Do you remember the date of the gift?

Mrs. Plumb: It was just about 15 years ago; that is all I can remember.

Q. Mr. Harris, do your children live with you at the present time? A. Yes.

Q. And do they go to school? A. Yes.

Q. And you pay their expenses, do you not? A. Yes.

Q. You receive as their guardian an allowance which is made by the Court in a former proceeding in this matter? A. Yes.

728

Q. And anything which is required by way of their support and education is paid by you? A. Yes.

Q. And are all their moneys invested in legal securities? A. All of that is invested in that way.

Mr. King: That is all.

The Referee: Any questions, Mr. Smyth?

Mr. Smyth: No.

The Referee: Any questions, Mr. Angulo?

Mr. Angulo: No, sir.

The Referee: Any questions, Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. Montgomery: No, sir.

729

(Discussion off the record.)

IEUAN HARRIS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 19th day of May, 1932.

DONALD J. WARNER Notary Public

Certificate (Seal)

730 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

(Whereupon, an adjournment was taken to Monday, May 16th, 1932, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.)

IN RE: The Application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB, etc.

No. 50 Broadway, New York City,
May 16, 1932, 10 o'clock A. M.

731 Before: TOWNSEND MORGAN, Esq., Referee.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. ANGULO.
Mr. EGAN.
Mr. SMYTH.
Mr. KING.

(Met pursuant to adjournment.)

732 WARREN L. MURRAY, recalled, testified further as follows:

By M. Smyth:

Q. Mr. Murray, have you prepared a statement showing what the principal consists of in the incompetent's estate, and what the market value of that principal is? A. Yes, sir.

Q. As distinguished from the inventory value in your accounts? A. I have.

Q. And what is the market value of those securities? A. The present market value, based on approximate prices, as of May 14th, is $872,814.86.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

733

The Referee: That is the market value as of Saturday?

The Witness: Yes, of the principal.

Q. As of May 14th, A. That is right.

Q. Does that include the mortgages? A. Yes, that does.

Q. But it does not include the real estate? A. It does not include the real estate, but it includes the contents at the houses in Geneva, New York, and Palm Beach, Florida, which I have itemized on the statement.

Q. What is the contents of the house at Palm Beach 734
supposed to be worth? A. Inventoried at $49,751.75.

Q. That is the personalty there? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the personalty in the Geneva house? A. Pardon me. I would like to amend that. I have the figures reversed here.

Q. All right. Is the personalty in the Geneva house, that is, $49,000, is that what you are saying now? A. That is right.

Q. What is the personalty in the Palm Beach house? A. $15,689.90.

Q. Has the Trust Company ever made any effort to sell that? A. Which property do you mean, Mr. Smyth? 735

Q. The personal property in both the Palm Beach and the Geneva house. Well, to your knowledge? A. To my knowledge I don't believe they have attempted to sell any of the personalty in the Geneva house. Some efforts may have been made as to the property in Florida, in connection with the sale of the real estate.

Q. That total of $64,000 in personal property— A. Yes, but I have some other items that should be included in that.

Q. Then, I ask you what they are. Let me ask you when that appraisal was made, the $14,000 for the Palm

736 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Beach contents, and $49,000 for the contents of the Geneva house? A. To the best of my recollection, I think the appraisals were made in 1926.

Q. And so that figure is not an appraisal of its value on May 14th, 1932? A. No.

Q. All right. Now, then, you say that there are some other items there other than bonds and mortgages? A. Yes, sir.

Q. I would like to know those. A. We have bonds composed of municipal, county and state bonds valued May
737 14th, to $539,150. We also have jewelry valued at $67,418, and a gold watch, unappraised, valued at $632.50.

Q. Anything else besides these? A. There is a small balance of cash as of the date of the last account of $222.71. There are some items of stock which are of questionable value.

Q. Have you appraised those as of May 14th, 1932? A. The stocks?

Q. Yes. A. There is no way of appraising the stocks.

Q. What are they carried at in your inventory? A. The stock is carried as $1000 in the inventory.

Q. That is all the stock, or just one item of stock? A. One item of stock.

738 Q. All right. One item of stock is carried at $1000? A. Yes.

Q. Any other stocks? A. The other stocks are not inventoried at any value.

Q. Now, Mr. Murray, out of that $872,000 of market value, is approximately $122,000 in personalty, including jewelry, contents of two houses and a watch and some stock of questionable value, is that right? A. What did you say the amount was?

Q. Well, approximately $122,000. A. That is right.

Q. So, Mr. Murray, would you say that there was about $750,000 only in marketable securities? A. I will say $750,000.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

739

Q. Then, you gave me a figure of $872,000 as current value of the estate. Now, then, in that $872,000 is approximately $64,000 for the contents of two houses, consisting of personal property valued in 1926 at $64,000, jewelry at $67,000, a watch at $600, and questionable stock at $1000? A. Yes.

Q. All of which would be deducted from the $872,000 and would leave approximately $750,000 in marketable securities? A. Yes.

Q. Are there any other items that I would deduct from the $750,000 if I was trying to get the marketable securities that could be liquidated? A. I would not say so, no, sir. 740

Q. Now, may I see that statement? A. Yes, sure (handing paper.)

Mr. Smyth: Mr. Referee, I would like to have that go in evidence, because these are the exact figures, and I called them out in round numbers.

The Referee: Any objection?

Mr. Montgomery: No objection.

(Paper received in evidence and marked Special Guardian's Exhibit 1, of this date.) 741

Q. Now, Mr. Murray, what is the income from that $750,000? A. The annual income, as I have approximated it at the present time, is $37,731.75.

(Discussion off the record.)

Q. In that $907,000 worth of liquid value of the accumulated income, Mr. Murray, that has no items of personalty or contents of houses or stock in it, has it? Do you remember that you testified the figure of

742 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

$1,051,000 inventory value of the accumulated surplus income had a market value of approximately $907,000. What I would like to know is if all of that $907,000 is in marketable securities? A. Yes, that is all in marketable securities, with the exception, perhaps, of the mortgage on the Spring Lake property. I don't know how marketable that is.

Q. Then, let me correct my question and say it is either in marketable securities or in mortgages? A. Yes.

Q. There are no items of tangible personal property?
743 A. None.

Q. What day did you figure the marketable value of the accumulated surplus? A. May 14th.

Q. And did you figure that as of Saturday when you were here? A. Oh, no, no.

Q. You took it off as though you had already figured it out before you came here? A. I am trying to recall the date now.

Mr. Montgomery: Was it in the near past?

The Witness: It was about a week ago.

The Referee: Some time during the month of May?
744

The Witness: Yes.

Mr. King: It was Thursday, wasn't it?

The Witness: It was before that.

Q. It was during the month of May, 1932? A. Just about a week ago, if I can figure it right.

The Referee: Now, it is from this $872,814.86 and the approximated $907,000 that the income is derived to support the incompetent and to make the distributions to the various beneficiaries, is that correct?

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

745

The Witness: That is right. Income from the Committee estate.

Mr. Angulo: There is the Houghton estate income too.

The Witness: I thought when you asked your question you were referring only to the income from the securities actually held in the Committee estate account.

Mr. Montgomery: There is other income, is there not, Mr. Murray?

The Witness: Other than those who own se- 746
curities?

Mr. Montgomery: There is income from the Houghton estate, is there not?

The Witness: Yes.

By the Referee:

Q. Can you give me an idea as to what the total income is from the two items I have just alluded to, plus the income from the Houghton estate? A. I believe the best answer to that question would be the approximation of income, or the receipt of income, for the year 1931.

Q. That is good enough. A. Which amounted to 747
$460,183.62, which included income received from the Houghton trust, income received from the securities constituting principal, and income from securities which constitute invested income.

Q. Now, assuming that you took from the principal of the estate $872,814.86, you would deprive that amount as just stated by you of the income amounting to $37,731.75, is that correct? A. That is right.

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. Mr. Murray, if this application was granted by the

748 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Court to take out $500,000, how much would that deprive the income of the incompetent? A. You mean take out $500,000?

Q. I mean take out $500,000 of the accumulated surplus which has a market value of $907,000, approximately; how much would that deprive an income to the estate? What is the average return of this estate? A. I should say that the average return would be—

Q. About 4 per cent? A. A little bit better than 4 per cent.

749 Q. Would you say it would deprive it of income of between $20,000 and $22,500?

The Referee: This is, of course, generally speaking.

(Discussion off the record.)

A. It is a little bit difficult—

The Referee: This is approximately.

Q. (Continued) What is the average yield on the income on the accumulated surplus? A. Invested income?

750

The Referee: Yes.

The Witness: I should say a little bit in excess of 4 per cent.

The Referee: A little in excess of 4 per cent?

The Witness: Yes, as an average.

The Referee: So you would say if you took a half million dollars and distributed it, it would deprive it of about $20,000 income, generally speaking?

The Witness: I should say it would be approximately that.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

751

Mr. Smyth: I have no more questions to ask. (Discussion off the record.)

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. You have already testified that the income from the Houghton estate has been reduced by $37,000 by the lowering of that dividend of approximately 10 per cent? A. I am not certain of the exact figures to which I have testified, but I know, as I testified, as to the reduction in the Houghton income.

752

The Referee: Any more questions, Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. Montgomery: No.

The Referee: You, Mr. Angulo?

By Mr. Angulo:

Q. Mr. Murray, what was the total income from the estate of the incompetent as testified before by you, excluding, of course, the Houghton trust income?

Mr. Montgomery: What year are you asking him about?

753

Mr. Angulo: At the present time.

A. You refer to the 1931 figure?

Q. Yes. A. The total income from the Houghton trust received was $382,770.84.

Q. I beg your pardon? A. $382,000.

Q. No, I said exclusive of the Houghton trust. A. Exclusive of the Houghton income—

Q. From the estate of the incompetent alone. A. $77,412.78.

Q. I notice that in the Special Guardian's Exhibit 1, the amount of the income received from the principal of

754 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

the incompetent's estate is stated to be $37,731.75. A. That is approximately correct.

Q. So that the difference represents the income received on the $907,000 during the year 1931? A. That is right; that is approximately $40,000.

Q. So that the rate of return on that $907,000 is, as I figure it, nearer 4-½ per cent than 4 per cent? A. Yes. I believe I said it was slightly in excess of four.

Q. Now, referring again to Special Guardian's Exhibit 1, these participating mortgages, you say at present not
755 immediately redeemable at par? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you explain just what you mean by that? A. Well, I mean that if orders were placed to sell the mortgages now held today, a sale could not be consummated at once. Mortgages have to be sold in the order in which they are placed.

Q. That might take some time? A. Yes, it might take considerable time. In some instances it might take considerable time depending on the amount that is put on for sale.

By Mr. Smyth:

756 Q. Have you a copy of that Special Guardian's Exhibit No. 1, Mr. Murray? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can I have that? A. Surely.

Q. And you testified that the figures here are all correct? A. You mean on this statement?

Q. On Special Guardian's Exhibit 1, all these figures are correct. I have asked you as to some of them, but not as to all. A. Yes, these figures are nearly as correct as you can possibly get them.

Q. Is this memorandum made up by you from the books? A. No, I made it up on the values at which the securities were currently quoted. As to items of bonds, stocks and mortgages—

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

757

Q. I mean you checked up those market values yourself? A. That is right. It is a little bit difficult to value municipal securities. You have to figure them on the yield basis, and while I did not have the actual current quotation on the last sale, I obtained the value as nearly as it could possibly be gotten.

The Referee: That might be a shade better or a shade worse.

The Witness: Yes, sir.

The Referee: Any more questions?

758

(No response.)

The Referee: Thank you very much, Mr. Murray.

The Witness: I would like to amend one answer I made the other day. I believe Mr. Smyth asked me as to the legality of the mortgages held in the Committee estate account, and I think I testified that all of them were legal mortgage participations. There is a mortgage held in the account which is on property in Spring Lake, New Jersey, which would not be a legal investment.

By Mr. Angulo:

759

Q. That is a purchase money mortgage on the sale of some real estate? A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. That is a purchase money mortgage on some real estate? A. Yes.

By the Referee:

Q. What does that amount to? A. $28,000

760 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. Is that a first or a second mortgage? A. I believe it is a first mortgage. I am sure it is.

Q. Do you know where the property is located in Spring Lake? A. Our bond and mortgage records show that the mortgage covers property at the northeast corner of Warren and First Avenue, Spring Lake, New Jersey.

Q. Do you know whether that is improved or not? A. Yes, that is improved.

761 Q. Do you get your interest regularly on that, or is that in default? A. I am pretty sure that the interest has been paid quite regularly on that.

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. That is a piece of property, Mr. Murray, which was owned by the incompetent and sold since she has been declared incompetent? A. That is right.

Q. And the mortgage is a part of the purchase price? A. That is right.

762 The Referee: Anything else?

(No response.)

The Referee: Thank you very much Mr. Murray.

Mr. Montgomery: What interest does that bear?

The Witness: 6 per cent.

WARREN L. MURRAY

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 19th day of May, 1932.

TOWNSEND MORGAN,
Referee.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

763

FREDERICK J. SCHLOBOHM, a witness, first being duly sworn, testified as follows:

By the Referee:

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Schlobohm? A. Mount Vernon, New York.

Q. Can you give me the address, street address? A. 20 William Street.

Direct Examination by Mr. Angulo:

764

Q. Mr. Schlobohm, are you connected with the City Bank-Farmers Trust Company? A. Yes, sir, I am.

Q. In what department? A. I am chief clerk of the Administration Department.

Q. Are you familiar with the trust created under the Charles F. Houghton will? A. Yes, sir, I am.

Q. And the incompetent here, Mrs. Vail, is the life beneficiary of that trust? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are the person in charge of the administration of that trust? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you familiar with the securities now held by the Trust Company as trustee of that trust? A. Yes, sir, I am. I have a statement of securities which we held as of April 8th, 1931, the date our accounting was filed in the Surrogate's Court of Steuben County, and there have been little changes in the securities since that date. 765

Q. Have there been any substantial changes? A. No, sir, there have not been.

Q. Will you tell us what the securities are in that account? A. We have in the account stock of the Corning Glass Works, common and second preferred; and also securities of the Steuben Securities Corporation.

Q. Will you state the number of shares? A. We have

766 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

15,120 shares of the second preferred stock of the Corning Glass Works.

Q. Will you state after the security the approximate yield thereof? A. 15,120 shares second preferred stock, 6 per cent; annual yield $90,720.; 30,240 shares, common stock, of Corning Glass Works which pays $226,800. Then we have other securities, most of them municipal, county state, bonds at an original inventory price of $1,148,000. Income at the approximate rate of 4 per cent—perhaps a little better than 4 per cent—that would be about
767 $45,000. The total income is the aggregation of these various items of income.

Q. Have you prepared, at my request a statement of the aggregate income received from the Houghton trust between the years 1920 to 1925, inclusive? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is that? A. The total income for those six years was $1,009,288.64.

Q. What was it year by year? A. For 1920 it was $103,627; 1921, $149,209; 1922, $129,073; 1923, $117,941; 1924, $370,334; 1925, $139,102. And then the total is $1,009,288, or an average of $166,666 a year.

Q. Have you a statement there of the income since
768 1926 to date on the Houghton trust? A. I have the figures here, but I have not taken them off. I had it understood that Mr. Murray had already testified to those figures.

Mr. Smyth: Except 1926, because that is the year she was declared incompetent.

The Witness: I have the figure for 1926 also.

Q. Will you tell us what they are? A. Yes. In 1926 the income is $440,661.

(Discussion off the record.)

Q. I show you Schedule H of what purports to be the account of City Bank-Farmers Trust Company as trus-

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

769

tee under the Houghton will, containing a list of securities that purports to show a statement of the present condition of said trust estate as of the date of the account, and ask you if this list substantially shows the securities and other property now held in the Houghton trust? A. Yes, sir, it does.

Mr. Angulo: I offer that statement in evidence.
The Referee: Any objection?
Mr. Smyth: No.
The Referee: It is received in evidence.

770

(Schedule H above referred to received in evidence and marked Committee of the Property Exhibit 1, of this date.)

(Discussion off the record.)

FREDERICK J. SCHLOBOHM

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 19th day of May, 1932.

TOWNSEND MORGAN
Referee.

771

WARREN L. MURRAY, resumed:

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. Mr. Murray, will you please give me the amount of income received from the Houghton Estate for the years 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, and 1931? A. Yes, sir; for the year 1926 there was received from the Houghton Es-

772 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

tate $135,591.27. That included income received from August 12th, 1926, to December 31st.

Mr. Smyth: That is not a full year, then?
The Witness: No, a half a year.

A. (Continued) For the year 1927 there was received from the Houghton estate $381,652.11. For the year 1928 there was received from the Houghton estate $393,112.34. For the year 1929 there was received from The Houghton estate $367,323.87. For the year 1930 there was received
773 from the Houghton estate $378,016.09. For the year 1931 there was received from the Houghton estate $382,770.84.

(Discussion off the record.)

WARREN L. MURRAY

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 19th day of May, 1932.

TOWNSEND MORGAN
Referee.

774

FREDERICK J. SCHLOBOHM, resumed:

By Mr. Montgomery:

Q. Will you please state whether the income which you gave for the years 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925 and 1926 as received from the estate of Houghton was the gross income or the net income? A. It was the net income.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

By the Referee:

Q. When you say net income, that is the gross income less the trustee's commission? A. And real estate expenses.

By Mr. King:

Q. And income taxes? A. No, sir; the income taxes are carried as a payment on account of income to her, because we paid the taxes, subject to her instructions.

In 1926 up until the time that Mrs. Vail became incompetent, we actually applied to her use either by paying taxes or paying it over to her, $42,300.77. Then, after she became incompetent, first we made a payment to Mrs. Plumb for her maintenance of $7,627.27; and then, during the remainder of the year, we paid over to ourselves as Committee for her $390,732.97, or a grand total as I testified to before, of $440,661.01.

(Discussion off the record.)

A. (Continued) Mr. King calls my attention to the fact that the dividends for the year 1926 on the Corning Glass stock amounted to $589,680. That is correct. And in addition to that we received approximately $40,000 of additional income on the other securities in the account, or a gross total of approximately $620,000 income on securities, which means, that during the year 1926 the total collections over disbursements were about $180,000. From time to time we carried accumulated income in the account, invested it. At the present time we have an accumulation of income in the account.

By Mr. Angulo:

Q. Does your account show when that was paid over to the trust company as Committee of Mrs. Vail's es-

778 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

tate? A. In subsequent years it was paid over to her—this does not show actually when the full amount of $180,000 was paid over to her. It was paid over from time to time. At the present time, according to the accounting, we have only a small amount of accumulated income on hand which I understand from Mr. Heustis will be necessary to meet certain expenses which he had intimated are chargeable against income in the accounting proceeding. I am not very familiar with that matter. I can tell you what the amount of—

779 Q. Wait a second. Did you hear Mr. Murray testify as to amounts of income paid to the Committee during the years 1926, 1927 and 1928 to date? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What I would like to get is, does that $180,000 represent the difference between the $440,000 that you testified to and the figure that Mr. King gave you; is that reflected and included in any amounts that Mr. Murray testified to? A. Yes, sir.

The Referee: Mr. Special Guardian?

Mr. Smyth: I have no questions to ask.

The Referee: Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. Montgomery: No.

780 The Referee: Mr. King?

Mr. King: Yes, I have a few questions.

By Mr. King:

Q. When you said there was a small amount of income left, you were speaking then of income from the Houghton estate? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Not the surplus of income of Mrs. Vail's own property? A. No, sir.

By Mr. Smyth:

Q. When did Mr. Houghton die? A. Mr. Houghton died on March 29th, 1897.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

781

The Referee: Anything else?

Mr King: No, sir.

The Referee: All right, thank you very much.

Mr. King: Mr. Referee, the order of reference does not recite any answer on the part of the General Guardian, although one was filed and served on all parties. I would like to leave a copy of that answer as part of your record. It is just the usual guardian's answer.

The Referee: Yes, surely. Is there any suggestion of any amendment to the petition, or anything of that character?

782

Mr. King: I do not think so at this time.

The Referee: Not at this time?

Mr. King: No, sir. I thought if we had to amend it at all, we would amend it before the Court.

The Referee: All right. Can you think of anything else, Mr. Special Guardian?

Mr. Angulo: Does your Honor wish a memorandum?

The Referee: I would like to have it. If you can give me a short memoranda, both sides, I think it would be very helpful. Can you do it within the next day or so?

Mr. Angulo: Yes, surely.

The Referee: Have you any suggestions?

783

Mr. Angulo: As far as the matter is discretionary, we do not feel that the Committee can be of any help in the matter. The guardian is here representing the incompetent, but the point that does trouble me, and I have told them very frankly is this, the matter whether the Court has the power to grant this application on the basis of this petition. It is to me, not a matter of obtaining an allowance. It seems to be the idea of distributing part of this incompetent's property in anticipation more or less of her death.

I do not think the Court simply because a person is in-

784 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

competent has any inherent power to give away a person's property.

There is plently of authority for the proposition. It seems to me if relatives of the incompetent are in need, and using the word "need" in a very broad and liberal sense, the Court will do what the incompetent would presumably have done, and on that very basis there has been already entered an order in favor of each of the parties here of $50,000, making a total of $100,000.

Now, if it is a matter of coming in and stating that is
785 not enough, because there was an indication here of one of the children of Mrs. Plumb going to college that will require something more than she has had—if there is any showing of that character which convinces the Court it should be increased, I can see that, but I am frank to say I have not been able to find any authority on the proposition where the Court can say here is an awful lot of money that the incompetent will not need, let us pay it out to the next of kin, and that is the thing that troubles me, whether the Court has the power to do that.

The Referee: You have got some cases?

Mr. Angulo: Yes.

The Referee: So you send them to me in your mem-
786 orandum, and if it is not too long, make that statement, just say what you did now, and you might submit, Mr. King.

Mr. King: I will submit a memorandum. I will be perfectly frank, your Honor. I have been to Mr. Angulo, and I do not pretend to you now that $50,000 is not adequate for the support or maintenance of three small boys. I think it is. In addition to that, I am perfectly frank to say that their father is perfectly able to take care of them and give them such education and physical comforts as they need.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

787

I do think, however, in a case of this sort where the income is almost entirely derived from the will of Charles F. Houghton, and in that will that he intended the income should be used for his widow. (I think the will itself has the expression "to use" it for that purpose,) and where it is impossible for her to use it by reason of the misfortune of her mental and physical condition, that then the Court can make an advancement, and in this case it is proper that it should do so.

I think the policy of the law as expressed in the statutory law is that the accumulations of income go to those 788
entitled to the next eventual estate

I think there are cases in which the court has held that an advancement was permissible. In the Brinkerhoff case that was affirmed in the Court of Appeals, there the question came up as to whether or not a certain distribution which had been made out of the estate should be treated as gifts, or whether they should be treated as advancements.

In that case, the Court said that the order did not provide that that should be treated as advancements and, therefore, they were not so treated, but, nevertheless, as a court of equity it had full authority to make such conditions in the order, and that equitable powers were broad 789
enough.

Now, Mrs. Vail is in a position where she cannot make a will. There is no question in the world who is going to get this property.

The Court of Appeals in the Flager case has held that the Court will stand in the shoes of the incompetent, and try to do what the incompetent person would have done if she were competent.

Mrs. Vail was always generous to her children. It does seem to me she would have regard of her husband's wishes in the matter, and she would have her children

790 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

have the benefits that she would like to have the children enjoy.

Here is Mrs. Plumb, who is 49 years of age. None of these grandchildren were alive in Mr. Houghton's time, but certainly if we can carry ourselves back to that time there can be no question that Mr. Houghton would wish these children to have the income.

I think Mrs. Vail, if she were in sound mind would want to carry out her husband's wishes. The only theory I can stand on in this court is, I think, that the advance-
791 ment is proper, and should be made under the circumstances.

Mr. Montgomery: With reference to Mr. Angulo's statement of the distribution, there is no question but what the Court can grant an allowance, and it can grant an allowance to go back several years. It has done so, and we will hand that case to you, so that there is no difference between granting an allowance here. For instance, if the Court should say she, the petitioner, should get an allowance of $50,000 a year extra, and that the three grandchildren should have $50,000 a year extra divided between them, but the Court in addition can say
792 that allowance shall date back two or three or four or five years, even unto the date of incompetency, and if you multiply that $50,000 a year for just four years, you will get the $200,000 we are asking for; so if the Court has the authority to starting the allowance back four or five years, there is no question but what it can do it in a lump sum it seems to me, and then continue the allowance on with the extra $50,000.

Mr. Duryee: While this income was accumulated for the past four or five years, there is no doubt that the Court had jurisdiction that allowance should be made. I do not feel that anything mysterious has happened to the

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

793

income since the accumulation which deprives the Court from the jurisdiction it unquestionably had while it was accumulating. In other words, the Court can say now, retroactively, that it will distribute and proportion part of the income that has accumulated during those years. It seems to me if it had jurisdiction while the income was accumulating, it still has it. There is no doubt about it, in my mind.

The Referee: Have you any cases along that line of thought?

Mr. Duryee: I have.

794

The Referee: Will you submit those to me, please?

Mr. Duryee: Yes.

The Referee: And send me a memorandum of that Brinkerhoff case.

Mr. King: In that case, the Court refers to a number of decisions, because it had been the custom of the incompetent person to share some of the money's with charitable institutions. I think the Court can do it. I think the circumstances here warrant it.

The Referee: Under the form of extra allowances?

Mr. King: Yes.

The Referee: Rather than a distribution of principal, as Mr. Angulo said?

795

Mr. Angulo: I will say in regard to Mr. King's argument, I know that case where the issue between us, is the same. My position is what that Court meant was simply this: If they did give an allowance under the general authority, they could attach to it a condition as they saw fit, that it should be treated as an advancement. In other words, if the Court here decides that Mrs. Plumb should have an allowance and not the infants represented by Mr. King, that the Court would stipulate and put in the order provision that in the event that Mrs. Plumb should be one of the next of kin of this incompetent, she would

796 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

have to put that amount in hodge-podge and be charged interest against it, and be treated as an advancement.

Mr. Montgomery: I think it would be all right if she got it and the others did not. Of course, when the estate was finally distributed, that allowance would have to be deducted from her share, of course.

Mr. King: I think in most of these cases we have been met by collateral relatives, and in that case the Court had some reluctance in granting applications, but in this particular case we have a situation where the persons to
797 be benefitted are the persons who most certainly will receive this property ultimately. I do not think that has always been so. I think in some of the cases the Court has said it will not undertake a distribution in advance of the death of an incompetent, because it cannot fairly assume the property will ultimately go to them, and might ultimately be taking away something from somebody who will be benefitted. That is not so in this case, and here the property must go to the people who will benefit by it.

The Referee: I think it is something to be considered.

Mr. Angulo: Mr. King's statement that it must go, does not follow, if Mrs. Plumb does not outlive her
798 mother. Then, it would go to her son. In other words, we cannot be sure who will be next of kin of Mrs. Vail, ultimately, but it is very unlikely there will be anybody else, except the ones who are here.

The Referee: Yes, but we will take into consideration those contingencies. Is there anything more to be said?

Mr. King: No, sir, I do not think so.

The Referee: Do you want to say anything more, Mr. Special Guardian.

Mr. Smyth: No.

The Referee: If you will send me that memorandum, I will appreciate it very much.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.

799

STIPULATED that the full fees of the stenographer, and the Referee, shall be paid by the Committee of the Property, and same shall be taxed as costs.

HEARINGS CLOSED.

FREDERICK J. SCHLOBOHM

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 19th day of May, 1932.

TOWNSEND MORGAN
Referee.

800

In Re: The Application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB, etc.

No. 30 Broadway, New York City.
May 16, 1932, 2 o'clock P. M.

Before: TOWNSEND MORGAN, Esq., Referee.

APPEARANCES:

MR. MONTGOMERY.
MR. ANGULO.
MR. EGAN.
MR. SMYTH.
MR. KING.

801

Mr. Montgomery: It is hereby stipulated, subject to the approval of the Court, by all the parties hereto that the petition of MaBelle Houghton Plumb be amended as follows:

The title of said petition shall read:

"New York Supreme Court, New York County

In the Matter of the Application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for an additional allowance to be paid to herself and others from the income received by the City Bank

802 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail, an Incompetent Person."

It is further stipulated, subject to the approval of the Court, that the prayer of said petition be amended to read as follows:

"Therefore, your petitioner prays for an order directing the City Bank-Farmers Trust Company, as committee of the property of said incompetent, to pay an additional allowance of $25,000 annually to your petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and $25,000 annually to Ieuan Harris,
803 as general guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris, David F. Harris, infants, out of the income received by said committee, and that said additional allowance of $25,000 to said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and to said Ieuan Harris, as said General Guardian, be retroactive for the past five years, payable out of the accumulated surplus income in the hands of the said committee; viz. to your petitioner the sum of $125,000 and said Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian, the sum of $125,000." and that an order of this Honorable Court may be entered in accord with this stipulation, without notice.

(Discussion off the record.)

804 Mr. Angulo: On behalf of the Committee of the Property I would like to respectfully submit to the Court that there is no evidence before it to indicate any reason as to why this extra allowance aggregating $250,000 should be granted and that the evidence now produced is substantially the same as that produced at the former hearing, at which allowances aggregating $100,000 per annum were granted and that in the absence of such proof the Court has not power to direct the distribution which is requested here.

As regards the future increase, there is evidence in the record that the applicant's needs will increase by reason of the fact that her son is now going to college and there-

805

fore the foregoing objection would not apply to the increase of the allowance in the future.

The Committee also urges the objection as regards the proposed distribution to the Harris infants on the ground that the record shows on its face that there present means are ample.

Mr. King: On behalf of the General Guardian he thinks it is his duty to submit the rights and interests of these infants to the protection of the Court and desires to record his insistence that any allowances that are made should be measured by the equality of treatment as between the petitioner and the infant wards of the General Guardian.

806

Mr. Montgomery: The petitioner, in reply to the objections of the Committee, states that in the opinion of her attorneys it is not necessary to show an actual need for the extra allowances of $25,000 per annum or for the making of the allowances retroactive for five years, but that the Court has ample power to grant an allowance if he finds from the record that the probabilities are that the incompetent, if competent, would grant the allowances as requested.

807

Mr. Angulo: It is stipulated by the parties that the answers heretofore filed by the various respondents shall be deemed to also apply to the petition as amended, and also that the briefs submitted should also apply to the amended petition.

Mr. Montgomery: We rest.

Mr. King: The General Guardian rests.

Mr. Smyth: I rest.

(Whereupon, at 3 o'clock P. M. the hearing was closed.)

808 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 26.*

No. 2866

State of New York } ss.:
County of New York }

I, ARCHIBALD R. WATSON, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, That I have compared the preceding with the original Testimony before Referee on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of
809 the whole of such original.

Filed. May 23, 1940.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, this 23 day of May, 1940.

ARCHIBALD R. WATSON
County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court,
(Seal) New York County.

810

Plaintiff's Exhibit 28. 811

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY

REPORT OF THE REFEREE.

IN THE MATTER

of the

Application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for an allowance to be paid to herself and others from the income now in the possession of the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the property of 812

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an incompetent person.

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE COUNTY OF NEW YORK:

I, TOWNSEND MORGAN, to whom the above matter was referred by an Order of this Court signed at Special Term, Part I thereof, on the 4th day of May, 1932, to take proof of the facts alleged in the petition herein and to report to the Court with all convenient speed upon the matters referred to me, with my opinion, do respectfully report as follows: 813

Before proceeding with the examination and hearing of the matter so referred to me, I duly took and subscribed the statutory oath as Referee, and the same is hereto annexed.

The hearings in this proceeding were duly held before me at my office at No. 50 Broadway, Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 13th day of May, the

814 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.*

16th day of May, and the 20th day of May, 1932, upon due notice to Messrs. Dean, King & Smith, attorneys for Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants; to Messrs. Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, attorneys for the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent, and upon Cornelius J. Smyth, Esquire, of the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, duly appointed in said Order as Special Guardian for and on behalf of the said
815 Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent, to appear and defend this proceeding on her behalf.

The following parties appeared at said hearings: MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, by Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, her attorneys; Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of said infants, by Dean, King & Smith, his attorneys; City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent, by Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, its attorneys, and the said Special Guardian, Cornelius J. Smyth.

The testimony taken before me, and such exhibits as are not now filed in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York, are annexed to this report.
816

I FIND AS FOLLOWS:

That MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, is the daughter of Helen Hall Vail by a prior marriage to Charles F. Houghton, now deceased.

That after the death of Charles F. Houghton, the said Helen Hall Vail married one Charles D. Vail, who died in the year 1922. That there was no issue of said second marriage.

That on the 12th day of August, 1926, the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, (now the City Bank Farmers

Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.

Trust Company), was appointed Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, and MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, was appointed the Committee of the person of Helen Hall Vail. 817

That said Helen Hall Vail will be 77 years of age in August, 1932, and is a widow.

That at the time the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company (now City Bank Farmers Trust Company) was appointed Committee of the property of said incompetent, there came into its possession certain property, both real and personal, which is now inventoried at $954,599.08, and which is held by the Committee of the said incompetent as principal. 818

That the said Helen Hall Vail by her first husband had three children, one of whom Florence Houghton, died in infancy; another of whom Laura Houghton Harris married Ieuan Harris on the 16th day of July, 1914 and died the 31st day of August, 1925, leaving three children; John H. Harris, now sixteen years of age, William R. Harris, now fifteen years of age, and David F. Harris, now twelve years of age; and your petitioner, who is the only other and surviving child of said Helen Hall Vail; and that said petitioner has only one child, a son, Joseph H. Plumb, Jr., who is now nineteen years of age. 819

That the said infant children of Laura Houghton Harris reside with their father, Ieuan Harris, at Salisbury, Connecticut, and that said Ieuan Harris has heretofore been duly appointed general guardian of said three children, has duly qualified as such, and is still acting as such.

That the Last Will and Testament of said Charles F. Houghton directs that upon the death of his wife, the said Helen Hall Houghton, now Helen Hall Vail, the incompetent, his residuary estate shall be divided into two equal parts, one to be held for his daughter, Laura Houghton Harris, the income to be paid to her during

820 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.*

her life, and upon her death leaving issue the principal of said part or share to be divided between her issue, share and share alike. The other of said part or share to be held for his daughter, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the income to be paid to her during her life, and upon her death leaving issue the principal of said part or share to be divided between her issue, share and share alike.

That prior to the respective marriages of Laura Houghton Harris and MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the daughters of the said incompetent, they lived with their mother.

821 That after their marriages, their mother, Helen Hall Vail, gave to them at various times, certain sums of money, one specific gift to each of them being the sum of $30,000.00.

That prior to the time when the petitioner noticed any peculiarity in the said Helen Hall Vail, she had repeatedly and over a long period of years evinced affectionate regard for her two daughters, and after the death of Laura Houghton Harris, toward her grandchildren, and had contributed various sums to them for their support and maintenance.

That said Helen Hall Vail is now at Dr. MacDonald's House, Central Valley, New York, to which institution she

822 was committeed by an Order of the Supreme Court, dated the 10th day of December, 1926, where she has all the comforts to which her position and affluence entitle her, and which are possible under the circumstances.

That the disease from which the said Helen Hall Vail is suffering is cerebral arterio sclerosis, with dementia, hallucinations and senile arterio-sclerotic chorea, and that the same is incurable, and there is no possibility of her ever being able to take care of her property.

That there has been a search made, and no Will of the incompetent has been found.

That upon the death of said Helen Hall Vail, one-half of her property now held by the Committee, representing

Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.

accumulated income and the property received by the Committee at the time of its appointment, will vest in said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and one-half will vest in said John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris.

That no Will of the incompetent having been discovered, the granting of the allowances herein prayed for, cannot interfere with any testamentary plan of the incompetent, and the inference is clear from the past generosity displayed by the incompetent toward your petitioner, and her grandchildren, that the granting of the allowances would be in accord with the intention and desires of the incompetent were she now competent to make them herself.

The net income received from the Houghton Estate prior to the adjudication is as follows—for 1920, $103,627.00; for 1921, $149,209.00; for 1922, $129,073.00; for 1923, $117,941.00; for 1924, $370,334.00; for 1925, $139,102.00; a total of $1,009,288.00, or an average of $166,666.00 a year. The amount in 1926 was $440,661.00.

That since the date of its appointment, the income received by the Committee for the account of the incompetent and the expenditures each year, are as follows:—

During the year 1926

From the Houghton Estate....	$135,591.27	
From accumulated income.....	17,678.00	
	$153,269.27	
That the disbursements during ing that year amounted to..	58,413.21	
Leaving an unexpended surplus income for that year of....		$ 94,856.06

826 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.*

During the year 1927		
From the Houghton Estate...	$381,652.11	
From accumulated income....	44,987.17	
	$426,639.28	
That the disbursements during that year amounted to.....	278,615.55	
Leaving an unexpended surplus income for that year of....		148,023.73
During the year 1928		
From the Houghton Estate...	$393,112.34	
From accumulated income.....	60,473.26	
	$453,585.60	
That the disbursements during that year amounted to.....	269,683.40	
Leaving an unexpended surplus income for that year of		183,902.20
During the year 1929		
From the Houghton Estate....	$367,323.87	
From accumulated income.....	64,425.62	
	$431,749.49	
That the disbursements during that year amounted to.....	259,829.86	
Leaving an unexpended surplus income for that year of.....		171,919.63

Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.

829

During the year 1930

From the Houghton Estate....	$378,016.09	
From accumulated income.....	69,185.97	
	$447,202.06	
That the disbursements during that year amounted to.....	235,921.36	
Leaving an unexpended surplus income for that year of.....		211,280.70

830

During the year 1931

From the Houghton Estate....	$382,770.84	
From accumulated income.....	77,412.78	
	$460,183.62	
That the disbursements during that year amounted to.....	219,087.38	
Leaving an unexpended surplus income for that year of		241,096.24

831

That the unexpended surplus income accumulated in each of these years has been invested by the Committee and is inventoried at $1,051,078.56

The market value as of May 14th, 1932 is and is invested in marketable securities and mortgages. $907,000.00

The market value of the invested property of the incompetent coming into the possession of the Committee was, as of May 14th, 1932 ..... $872,814.86

832 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.*

The inventoried value of the contents of the house at Geneva, N. Y., is..... $49,751.75

The inventoried value of the contents of the house at Palm Beach, Fla., is..... $15,689.90

After hearing all of the parties to this proceeding, and the testimony of the witnesses, and considering all the facts and circumstances, the advanced years of the incompetent and the incurable nature of her disease, and the fact that the first husband of the incompetent, namely
833 Mr. Charles F. Houghton, by the terms of his Will left his entire estate to the Farmers' Loan & Trust Company (now City Bank Farmers Trust Company) as Trustee, for the use of his widow during her life, and that upon the death of the widow, this estate was to be equally divided, one-half for the benefit of Laura with the remainder to her issue, which issue in this proceeding are represented by their General Guardian, and the other one-half for the benefit of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, with remainder to her issue.

It seems to the Referee that from the provisions of Mr. Houghton's Will that his desire was to benefit not only his widow, but also his daughters and their issue.
834 It seems to the Referee that it is entirely clear from the record before him that the relationship existing between the incompetent and her daughters during her normal life was characterized by a spirit of generosity evidenced by substantial gifts to them and by many tokens of affection, and a desire on her part to carry out what she conceived to be the wishes of her deceased husband.

There came into the possession of the Committee of the incompetent, namely the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as capital belonging to the incompetent, at the present inventoried at $954,599.08. There appears in addition to the large dividend paying securities of the Corning Glass Company now in the principal account of the

Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.

Houghton Estate, various municipal, county and state first mortgage bonds, amounting to, at original inventory value, the sum of $1,148,000 and yielding over 4%, none of which are in default. There is also the accumulated surplus income at present market amounting to $907,000. It is from the latter amount, namely $907,000 accumulated income the petitioner asks this Honorable Court for an allowance to her and it seems that the annual income of the incompetent is vastly in excess of the amount required to maintain her in comfort and luxury and to pay for the care and maintenance of her real property, taxes, etc., and the annual amount to be paid by the Committee under said Order of January 14, 1927, and the parties having stipulated that the petition be amended subject to the approval of the Court as follows:

The title of said petition shall read as follows:

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

NEW YORK COUNTY

In the Matter

of the

Application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB for an additional allowance to be paid to herself and others from the income received by the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the Property

of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an incompetent person.

That the prayer of said petition be amended to read as follows:—

Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.

838 Wherefore your petitioner prays for an Order directing the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the property of said incompetent, to pay an additional allowance of $25,000. annually, to your petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and $25,000. annually to Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris, and David F. Harris, infants, out of the income received by said Committee, and that said additional allowances of $25,000. to said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and to said Ieuan Harris, as said General Guardian, be made re-
839 troactive for the past five years, payable out of the accumulated surplus income in the hands of the said Committee, viz., to your petitioner the sum of $125,000. and to said Ieuan Harris, as such General Guardian, the sum of $125,000.

I RECOMMEND that there be granted annually to MaBelle Houghton Plumb an allowance of $25,000. and to Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian, of John H. Harris, William R. Harris, and David F. Harris, infants, an allowance of $25,000. to be applied by him toward the maintenance and support of the said infants, said allowances
840 to be paid quarterly on the thirty-first days of March, June, September and December, in each year and to be in addition to allowances heretofore granted by Order of the Supreme Court, dated the 14th day of January, 1927, to the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, provided that after due provision having been made for the maintenance and care of the incompetent and the incompetent's property and any other proper charges against the income of the incompetent there be sufficient income remaining to pay the same, and if there be not sufficient income in any year

841

that the balance of income for that year, after all necessary charges have been met, be divided equally between the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and the said Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of the said infants, and

I RECOMMEND further that the said allowance of $25,000. per annum to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris, and David F. Harris, infants be made retroactive for the last past five years and payable out of accumulated surplus income in the hands of the Committee of the property on December 31st, 1931, that is to say, that $25,000. be paid to the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and to the said Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of the said infants for the year ending December 31st, 1931, $25,000. for the year ending December 31st, 1930, $25,000. for the year ending December 31st, 1929, $25,000. for the year ending December 31st, 1928, and $25,000. for the year ending December 31st, 1927. The total of said retroactive allowances to the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb to aggregate $125,000.00, and the total of said retroactive allowances to the said Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of said infants, to aggregate $125,000.00 and

842

843

I RECOMMEND further that the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the said incompetent person, be instructed to pay to the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb the sum of $131,250.00, being $125,000. on account of retroactive allowances out of surplus accumulated income for the five years ending December 31st, 1931, and $6,250.00 being the quarterly installment due March 31st, 1932, of additional allowance herein recommended to be paid; and to pay to the said Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, the sum of $131,250.00, being

844 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 28.*

$125,000. on account of retroactive allowances out of surplus accumulated income for the five years ending December 31st, 1931, and $6,250.00 being the quarterly installment due March 31st, 1932, of additional allowances herein recommended to be paid.

Respectfully submitted,

TOWNSEND MORGAN
Referee

845 Dated, May 25th, 1932.

846

Plaintiff's Exhibit 29.

847

At a Special Term, Part II of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, held in and for the County of New York, at the County Court House, in the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 31st day of May, 1932.

Present: HONORABLE PHOENIX INGRAHAM, Justice.

848

IN THE MATTER

of the

Application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for an additional allowance to be paid to herself and others from the income received by the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an incompetent person

849

The parties hereto having stipulated that the title of the petition herein and the prayer of the petition should be amended, subject to the approval of the court, as set forth in the record herein and in the report of the referee, and that an Order to that effect should be entered without notice, and the court having approved of said amendments to said petition,

Now, on motion of Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, attorneys for the petitioner, it is

850 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 29.*

ORDERED that the title of the petition heretofore filed herein, and the prayer of said petition, be amended in accordance with said stipulation.

Enter

P I
J S C.

---

851 No. 2887

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.:

I, ARCHIBALD R. WATSON, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County,

DO HEREBY CERTIFY, That I have compared the preceding with the original Order on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of the whole of such original.

852 Filed, June 2, 1932.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, this 23 day of May, 1940.

(Seal)

ARCHIBALD R. WATSON,
County Clerk and Clerk of the
Supreme Court, New York County.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 30. 853

At a Special Term, Part I of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, held in and for the County of New York, at the County Court House, in the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 3rd day of June, 1932.

Present: Honorable PHOENIX INGRAHAM Justice.

IN THE MATTER 854

of the

Application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb for an additional allowance to be paid to herself and others from the income received by the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an incompetent person.

ON READING and FILING the amended petition of MABELLE 855
HOUGHTON PLUMB praying for an additional yearly allowance of $25,000.00 for herself and for Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants and further praying that said allowance be made retroactive for five years and that said additional allowances for the past five years amounting to $25,000. each year be paid out of the accumulated surplus income in the possession of the said Committee, $125,000.00 to the petitioner and $125,000.00 to said Ieuan Harris as such Guardian, and

856 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 30.*

ON READING the answer of Cornelius J. Smyth, the Special Guardian duly appointed by this Court by an Order dated the 4th day of May, 1932, to protect the interests of the said incompetent, which said Order dispensed with service of all papers in this proceeding upon the incompetent, the answer of the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of the incompetent Helen Hall Vail, by Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, its attorneys, and the Answer of Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and
857 David F. Harris, infants by Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, his attorneys, and an Order having been duly entered in this Court on the 4th day of May, 1932, appointing Townsend Morgan, Esquire, Referee to hear and take testimony of the respective parties and to report to this Court with his opinion with all convenient speed, and

ON READING the report of the said Referee dated the 25th day of May, 1932, heretofore duly filed herein, wherein he recommends that allowances be granted as prayed for, and

858 ON READING the report of the Special Guardian heretofore duly filed herein, and

ON READING the testimony taken at said Hearing from which it appears that there is accumulated income in the possession of the Committee of an inventoried value of $1,051,078.56, and whereas from the said testimony it appears that the income for the past five and one-half years has averaged about $395,000.00 a year, and the surplus income after paying all expenses, including allowances heretofore granted by the Order of January 14th, 1927, and paying all expenses, and etc. on account of the incompetent for her care and maintenance averaged about $191,105.18 a

Plaintiff's Exhibit 30.

859

year, and it further appearing that said Helen Hall Vail is seventy-seven years of age and will not recover from the disease from which she is suffering and that her only issue is the petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb and her son, Joseph H. Plumb, Jr., and the three infants, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, children of a deceased daughter of the incompetent, and that said Helen Hall Vail has not made her Last Will and Testament, and that upon the death of the said incompetent the only persons entitled to share in her estate will be the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb the only surviving child of said incompetent and her son, Joseph H. Plumb, Jr., and the said John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris the three children of a deceased daughter of said incompetent, or their issue, and this Court having found upon the evidence submitted before the said Referee and to this Court, that if the said incompetent, Helen Hall Vail, were in possession of her mental faculties and in all respects competent, she would desire that the allowance hereinafter fixed be made to the persons hereinafter designated, and would make such allowances to such persons out of her property, and

860

861

On reading the affidavit of John S. Montgomery, Esquire, a member of the firm of Montgomery, Peabody & Grace, the attorneys for the petitioner, and the affidavit of Cornelius J. Smyth, Esquire, Special Guardian of the incompetent, the affidavits of Townsend Morgan, Esquire, Referee, the affidavit of Frederick P. King, Esquire, a member of the firm of Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, the attorneys for Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants and the affidavits of Charles Angulo, Esquire, a member of the firm of Taylor, Blanc, Capron & Marsh, attorneys for the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee

862 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 30.*

of the property of the incompetent, with respect to the services rendered by each of them in this proceeding, and no objection having been made except by the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the Property, and

ON READING and FILING proof of service of the Notice of Settlement of this Order upon all the parties who have appeared herein,

863 NOW ON MOTION OF MONTGOMERY PEABODY & GRACE, attorneys for said petitioner, it is

ORDERED that the CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY as Committee of the Property of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person pay out of the income received by it in each quarter, on the last day of the quarter, to wit: the last days of March, June, September and December in each year, in addition to the amounts paid by it under the Order of this Court dated the 14th day of January, 1927, provided that there be sufficient surplus income at the end of each quarter so to do, after deducting all other payments for that quarter, the following sums to the follow-
864 named persons—

To MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB, the petitioner, the daughter of said incompetent, the sum of SIX THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY ($6,250.) DOLLARS;

To IEUAN HARRIS, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of SIX THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY ($6,250.00) DOLLARS; and it is further

Plaintiff's Exhibit 30.

865

ORDERED that out of the surplus income now in its possession that the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail an incompetent person pay

TO MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB, the petitioner, the sum of ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS ($131,250.00) representing a payment of twenty-five Thousand Dollars ($25,000.) per annum, for the past five years, and of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250.), being the quarterly installment due March 31st, 1932, of additional allowances 866
as above ordered, and

TO IEUAN HARRIS as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS ($131,250.00), representing a payment of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars ($25,000.) per annum for the past five years, and of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250.) being the quarterly installment due March 31st, 1932, of additional allowances as above ordered, and it is further

867

ORDERED that the said City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, pay out of the income in its possession the following sums—

TO TOWNSEND MORGAN, ESQUIRE, the Referee, the sum of FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS, as and for the allowance to which he is entitled, for his services herein;

TO CORNELIUS J. SMITH, ESQUIRE, the Special Guardian of the incompetent person, the sum of SIXTY FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS as and for the allowance to which he is entitled, for his services herein;

868 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 30.*

To MONTGOMERY, PEABODY & GRACE, as attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner, the sum of SIXTY FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein, together with the sum of Two HUNDRED DOLLARS, to cover their disbursements herein;

To DEAN, KING, SMITH & TAYLOR, as attorneys for Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of TWENTY FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS, as
869 and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein;

To TAYLOR, BLANC, CAPRON & MARSH, as attorneys for the City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail the incompetent, the sum of TWENTY FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS, as and for the allowance to which they are entitled, for their services herein, and it is further

ORDERED that if upon the death of Helen Hall Vail the incompetent, it shall appear that the total allowances received by MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and the total ag-
870 gregate allowances received by the said three grandchildren, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, or their guardian, Ieuan Harris for their account, shall not be equal to each other, that the excess received by either MaBelle Houghton Plumb, or the said three grandchildren, or their guardian, shall be considered as an advancement, and it is further

ORDERED that for the purpose of raising sufficient cash with which to make the payments hereinbefore directed to be made at this time, said City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property as aforesaid, sell

Plaintiff's Exhibit 30.

871

forthwith the following securities, at the prices set opposite the same below, or better, and that it expend the net proceeds thereof in making said payment after having applied thereto any cash income now in its hands available for that purpose.

List of property to be sold by the Committee of the property of the Incompetent at the prices listed opposite the same or better.

$30,000. par value City of Cleveland, Ohio, Water Works 4½s due 12/1/36 @ 93

872

10,000. par value City of Kansas City, Missouri, Missouri River Bridge Gold Bonds, Series 21, 4¼s due 4/1/49 @ 92

20,000. par value registered City of Minneapolis permanent improvement 4s, due 9/1/46 @ 90

10,000. par value City of Mt. Vernon North Fourth Avenue widening 3¾s due 10/1/42 @ 81

30,000. par value City of Mt. Vernon North Fourth Avenue widening 3¾s due 10/1/43 @ 81

5,000. par value City of New Rochelle, New York, Municipal Improvement Bonds, Series of 1929 4¼s due 5/1/37 @ 91

873

5,000. par value of City of New Rochelle, New York, School Board, Series of 1929, 4¼s due 5/1/37 @ 91

12,000. City of New York Corp. Stock to provide for supply of water 4¼s due 3/1/64 @ 75

51,000. City of New York Corp. stock for construction of rapid transit railway 4¼s due 3/1/81 @ 75

874 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 30.*

18,000. City of Trenton, New Jersey, Series A 363 General Improvement Funding Bonds of 1929 4¼s due 2/1/39 @ 90

35,000. State of New Jersey State Highway Bd. Act. of 1927 Series A 4¼s due 7/1/44 @ 95

12,000. par value State of West Virginia Roads Series A 1931, 3½s due 6/1/50 @ 82

30,000. State of West Virginia Roads, Series A. 1931 3½s due 6/1/54 @ 82

875

And if the net proceeds of the foregoing should prove insufficient, then also, in so far as required to make up the deficiency the following—

$25,000. Cuyohoga County, Ohio, Jail and Court House Buildings, 4¼s due 4/1/45 @ 84

10,000. City of Newark, New Jersey, Port Newark Improvement 4¼s due 8/1/43 @ 86

1,000. City of Newark Market House, 4½s due 12/1/48 @ 84

876 16,000. County of Hudson, New Jersey Park Bonds 4s due 11/1/54 @ 72

4,000. County of Hudson, New Jersey Park Bonds 4s due 5/1/54 @ 72

Enter,

P. I.
J. S. C.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 30.

877

No. 2899.

State of New York,
County of New York, } ss.:

I, ARCHIBALD R. WATSON, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County,

DO HEREBY CERTIFY, That I have compared the preceding with the original Order on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of the whole of such original.

878

Filed. June 3, 1932

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, this 23 day of May, 1940.

ARCHIBALD R. WATSON
County Clerk and Clerk of the
Supreme Court, New York County.

879

880 **Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.**

SUPREME COURT:

NEW YORK COUNTY

REPORT OF SPECIAL GUARDIAN

IN THE MATTER

OF THE

881 Application of MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB for an allowance to be paid to herself and others from the unexpended surplus income now in the possession of the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an incompetent person.

I, CORNELIUS J. SMYTH, heretofore appointed by order of Honorable Phoenix Ingraham, one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, dated the
882 4th day of May, 1932, as Special Guardian of HELEN HALL VAIL, incompetent, hereby render my report as follows:

This proceeding is a petition by MABELLE HOUGHTON PLUMB, daughter of HELEN HALL VAIL, the incompetent herein, which petition sets forth that the incompetent was on August 11, 1926 adjudged to be incompetent, and that an order was entered by the Supreme Court of New York County on August 12, 1926, confirming the findings of the Sheriff's Jury; that the petitioner was appointed Committee of the Person of the incompetent, and the Farmers Loan & Trust Company (now the City Bank

Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.

Farmers Trust Company) was appointed Committee of the Property of the incompetent; that the incompetent is suffering from cerebral arterio sclerosis, with dementia, hallucinations and senile arterio-sclerotic chorea, and that her condition holds out no hope for recovery. 883

The said petition further sets forth that the incompetent is eighty (80) years of age and a widow; that she was married in 1878 to Charles F. Houghton, who died on March 30, 1896; that the incompetent re-married in the year 1902, marrying Charles Vail, who died in the year 1922; that the incompetent had three children, all by her first marriage, one of whom, Florence Houghton, died without issue, one of whom, Laura Houghton Harris, died leaving three children, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, all infants, the third child being MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the petitioner; that one Ieuan Harris, is the father and General Guardian of the three infant children of Laura Houghton Harris. 884

The petition further sets forth that Charles F. Houghton devised his residuary estate in trust, and directed the trustee to apply the income to the use of the incompetent during her life, and upon her death, to divide the same into two equal parts, and to apply the income of one part to the use of his daughter Laura Houghton Harris during her life, and the income of the other part to the use of the petitioner during her life, with the further provision that upon the death of either of the said daughters, leaving issue her surviving, the part so held in trust for her should vest in her issue, share and share alike; that the petitioner has one child, Joseph H. Plumb, Junior, who is now nineteen (19) years of age, and that Laura Houghton Harris died August 31, 1925. 885

The petition also sets forth that the incompetent had been in the habit of contributing out of her income annually sums for the support of her two daughters, Laura

886 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.*

Houghton Harris and the petitioner; that the Committee, in its last annual inventory as of the 31st day of December, 1931, showed that it had in its possession principal amounting to $956,805.78 and accumulated income in the sum of $1,051;078.55; that the said $1,051,078.55 of income represents the total amount of accumulated surplus income since the date of the appointment of the Committee; that the income of the incompetent comes from two sources (1) the income from her estate held by the Committee, and (2) income from the estate of Charles F.
887 Houghton, deceased; that the total annual income received by the incompetent has been as follows:

For the year ending

December 31, 1926 (August 12th to December 31st)	$177,269.27
December 31, 1927	426,639.28
December 31, 1928	453,585.60
December 31, 1929	431,730.74
December 31, 1930	447,202.06
December 31, 1931	460,183.62

That the surplus income for the year 1931 was $241,096.24.

888 The petitioner prays for an order directing the Committee of the Property to pay out of the unexpended surplus accumulated income in the possession of the Committee to the petitioner the sum of Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($250,000) and to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, the sum of Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($250,000), and that such other and further relief may be granted to the petitioner as shall be deemed proper.

At the hearings before the Referee herein, it was shown that the petitioner receives an annual allowance from the

Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.

estate of the incompetent of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000) and that Ieuan Harris receives as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, an annual allowance of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000). That these allowances are paid to the petitioner and to Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of the aforementioned infants, under an order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, dated January 14, 1927. 889

After the testimony was given before the Referee at the hearings, the attorney for the petitioner asked leave to amend the petition, subject to the approval of this Honorable Court, so that the prayer of the petition would be that the Court allow an additional allowance of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars ($25,000) a year to the petitioner and an additional allowance of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars ($25,000) a year to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, and, further, that said allowances be made retroactive, to cover the years 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930 and 1931, so that there would be paid to the petitioner a back or retroactive allowance of One Hundred Twenty-five Thousand Dollars ($125,000) and there would be paid to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, a back or retroactive allowance of One Hundred Twenty-five Thousand Dollars ($125,000). 890 891

The proof submitted at the hearings shows briefly the following facts:

That Helen Hall Vail was on the 11th day of August, 1926, adjudged to be incompetent to manage herself and her affairs by a Sheriff's Jury of New York County, and that an order of the Supreme Court of New York County was entered on the 12th day of August, 1926, confirming in all respects the findings of the said Sheriff's Jury.

892 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.*

That the Farmers Loan and Trust Company (now City Bank Farmers Trust Company) was appointed Committee of the Property of the incompetent, and that the petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb was appointed Committee of the Person of the incompetent.

That the incompetent is an inmate of Dr. MacDonald's House, at Central Valley, New York, and was admitted for observation there on September 16, 1926, and legally committed on December 10, 1926. That the incompetent is suffering from a form of mental disease, which is known
893 medically as psychosis or demetia with cerebral arterio sclerosis, characterized by confusion and delusion, and the incompetent is further suffering with a physical condition known as chorea, which is a convulsive state, and that her physical and mental condition have not improved since her admission to Dr. MacDonald's House; that age increases the physical and mental ailments of the incompetent, and her condition will become more accentuated as time goes on, and there is no hope of her recovery. The incompetent has no lucid or rational intervals, and she is not capable of judging of her estate and her means.

That the incompetent is between seventy-seven (77) and
894 eighty (80) years of age and her condition is not curable, but becomes progressively worse. That the incompetent occupies a suite at Dr. MacDonald's House, consisting of a bedroom, sitting room, bath and an additional sun room. That Dr. MacDonald's House is on an estate located at Central Valley, New York, which covers two hundred fifty (250) acres. The incompetent has two day nurses and a night nurse; that she has three doctors in attendance, and on every fair day she is taken for a trip around the country about Central Valley in an automobile, and she has every comfort, convenience and luxury which money can buy, and is denied nothing by her daughter, the Committee of the Person.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.

895

That no limit is put on the amount of money spent for the comfort of the incompetent and no recommendation by Dr. MacDonald's House for the expenditure of money for the comfort, convenience, physical or mental well being of the incompetent has ever been denied. That outside alienists were called in for consultation, who are specialists in mental diseases.

That the incompetent has a separate estate, the principal of which is now in the hands of the Committee of the Property and on December 31, 1931, amounted to Nine Hundred Fifty-four Thousand, Five Hundred Ninety-nine and 08/100 Dollars ($954,599.08). The Committee of the property receives for the account of the incompetent 896

1. Income from the property received on its appointment belonging to the incompetent;
2. Income from the trust fund created under the Will of Charles F. Houghton;
3. Income from the surplus income which has been invested from time to time since the appointment of the Committee of the Property.

For the period from the date of its appointment, August 12, 1926, to December 31, 1926, the Committee of the Property received as income $153,269.27, and had a balance of surplus income for said period, after making all payments, of $94,856.06. 897

For the year 1927, the Committee of the Property received as income for the account of the incompetent the sum of $426,639.28, and had a balance of surplus, after payments for personal maintenance, maintenance of real property, income taxes, Committee's commissions and allowances, of $148,023.73.

898 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.*

For the year 1928, the Committee of the Property received as income for the account of the incompetent the sum of $453,588.60, and had a balance of surplus, after payments for personal maintenance, maintenance of real property, income taxes, Committee's commissions and allowances, of $183,902.20.

For the year 1929, the Committee of the Property received as income for the account of the incompetent the sum of $431,749.49, and had a balance of surplus, after payments for personal maintenance, maintenance of real
899 property, income taxes, Committee's commissions and allowances, of $171,919.63.

For the year 1930, the Committee of the Property received as income for the account of the incompetent the sum of $447,202.05, and had a balance of surplus, after payments for personal maintenance, maintenance of real property, income taxes, Committee's commissions and allowances of $211,280.70.

For the year 1931, the Committee of the Property received as income for the account of the incompetent the sum of $460,183.62, and had a balance of surplus, after payments for personal maintenance, maintenance of real
900 property, income taxes, Committee's commissions and allowances, of $241,096.24.

That the accumulated surplus income in the possession of the Committee on December 31, 1931 was One Million, Fifty-one Thousand, Seventy-eight and 56/100 Dollars ($1,051,078.56) and has an actual market value as of the present time of Nine Hundred Seven Thousand, Two Hundred seventy-seven and 69/100 Dollars ($907,277.69).

That the principal of the incompetent's separate estate in the hands of the Committee has an estimated market value as of May 14, 1932, of Seven Hundred Thirty-Nine Thousand, One Hundred Dollars ($739,100), and this

Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.

figure does not take into consideration the contents of the house at Geneva, valued at $49,751.75, the contents of the house at Palm Beach, Florida, valued at $15,689.90, and jewelry valued at $67,418. Nor does this figure of $739,100 take into consideration the real estate at Geneva, New York, appraised at $45,275 and the real estate at Palm Beach, Florida, appraised at 196,274.25. 901

The principal of the separate estate of the incompetent is invested in bonds and mortgages. None of the bonds in the estate are in default, and none of the mortgages are in default, and the mortgages, with the exception of a purchase money mortgage covering property at Spring Lake, New Jersey, are legal investments for trustees in the State of New York. 902

The Charles F. Houghton Estate, of which the incompetent is the life beneficiary, has as its principal source of income, dividends on stock of the Corning Glass Company, the dividend on which was reduced from sixty-two and one-half cents (62½¢) a share to fifty-six and one-quarter cents (56¼¢) a share in 1932, which would decrease the income from the Charles F. Houghton Estate to the incompetent in the sum of $22,680. The incompetent receives from the Charles F. Houghton Estate approximately Three Hundred Sixteen Thousand Dollars ($316,000) a year, which represents proceeds of the dividends on common stock and approximately Sixty Thousand Dollars ($60,000) a year which is derived from investments legal for trustees in the State of New York. 903

In 1931, the payments made during the year out of income totalled $219,087.38 in items as follows:

Allowances pursuant to court order of January 14, 1927	$109,000.00
Personal maintenance of the incompetent	17,716.18
Maintenance of real property	21,111.31

904 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.*

Income taxes	65,603.05
Payments for accrued interest in the purchase of securities and miscellaneous expenses	5,656.84
making a total of	$219,087.38

and the amount of surplus income for the year 1931, as above stated was $241,096.24.

No will of the competent has ever been discovered
905 although careful search has been made.

The incompetent was married to Charles F. Houghton, who died on March 30, 1896, and thereafter she married, Charles Vail, who died in the year 1922. She had no children by her second husband.

The issue of the first marriage are, Florence Houghton, who died without issue; Laura Houghton Harris, who died leaving three children, John H. Harris, now sixteen years of age, William R. Harris, now fifteen years of age and David F. Harris, now twelve years of age, and MaBelle Houghton Plumb, your petitioner.

There are no other next of kin, and the parties for whom the allowance is prayed for in the petition in this
906 proceeding are the only ones who would inherit the estate if the incompetent were to die at the present time, and are the only ones interested in the estate as next of kin. The petitioner prays for an allowance which will be divided between the two branches of the family that will inherit equally. The parties who will receive the allowance prayed for in this petition are the parties who will eventually share equally in the estate of Charles F. Houghton on the termination of the life estate to the incompetent, HELEN HALL VAIL.

The will of Charles F. Houghton, deceased husband of the incompetent, devised his residuary estate in trust,

Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.

and directed the trustee to apply the income to the use of the incompetent during her life, and upon her death, to divide the same into two equal parts, and to apply the income of one part to his daughter, Laura Houghton Harris during her life, and the income of the other part to the petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, during her life, with a further provision that upon the death of either of the said daughters, leaving issue her surviving, the part so held in trust for her should vest in her issue, share and share alike. 907

If the incompetent died at the present time, one-half the estate of Charles F. Houghton would be divided among the three children of Laura Houghton Harris, hereinbefore named, and the income on the other half would go to the petitioner MaBelle Houghton Plumb for her life, and on her death, the principal of this half would vest in the son of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, Joseph H. Plumb, Jr. This son of the petitioner is preparing to enter college in the Fall, which will considerably increase her expenses. She has no source of income, except from the estate of the incompetent under an order of the Supreme Court, with the exception of a small income amounting to about One Hundred Fifty Dollars ($150) a year. She is forty-nine (49) years of age and her son is nineteen (19) years. The incompetent brought her up in luxurious surroundings, and when sane was most generous to her in the way of gifts and allowances, as well as to the deceased daughter, Laura Houghton Harris. 908 909

At one time, the incompetent gave the sum of Thirty Thousand Dollars ($30,000) to the petitioner to buy a house, and at another time a check for Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000) when she started for Australia. The incompetent was always most affectionate with both her daughters and also with her four grandchildren. She sent her daughters to one of the most fashionable board-

910 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.*

ing schools around New York City. She sent her daughters on a trip around the world, which lasted for a year and one-half, and which included visits to Egypt, China and Japan. There were four in the party, and all expenses were borne by the incompetent. The incompetent was liberal in making allowances to her two daughters, treating them equally, first giving them Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000) a year and later Six Thousand Dollars ($6,000) a year. She made many presents of expensive jewelry to them and gifts of cash. The allowances
911 to the daughters were kept up by the incompetent despite the fact that they married, and the gifts continued to the daughters after their marriages, and although Mrs. Laura Houghton Harris was not dependent on her mother, the gifts to the petitioner were usually equalized in gifts to Mrs. Laura Houghton Harris.

The incompetent constantly visited her daughters and her grandchildren. She was cognizant of the fact that her daughter Mrs. Laura Houghton Harris was not dependent upon her at any time for support or financial aid, and knew that her married life was characterized with a great deal of luxury, travelling abroad, a large house and a number of servants. Notwithstanding this,
912 the allowance of Six Thousand Dollars ($6,000) a year was kept up to Laura Houghton Harris, and the incompetent gave this daughter a house assessed at about Twenty-seven Thousand Dollars ($27,000) as a present, roughly equalizing the gift of a house to the petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb.

Allowances to relatives of an incompetent have been made upon the theory that the lunatic would in all probability have made such payments if he had been of sound mind. See Re Flatler, 248 N. Y. 415 (1928); Re Lord, 227 N. Y. 145.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.

913

In this proceeding, it is first to be noted that the petitioner is not a collateral relative who would not inherit, and who is not a next of kin of the incompetent, but the allowance is asked for a daughter and for grandchildren, who will share the estate of the incompetent upon her death, and who will share the estate of Charles F. Houghton on the death of the incompetent, who is the life beneficiary, and from which the bulk of the incompetent's income is derived.

The expense of maintaining the incompetent runs between Seventeen Thousand Dollars ($17,000) and Twenty-
914
five Thousand Dollars ($25,000) a year, and despite the present allowances under the court order of January 14, 1927, the incompetent has accumulated surplus income in the year 1931 amounting to $219,087.38, and over a period of five years has accumulated surplus income at the rate of approximately $200,000 a year, with a gross accumulation of $1,051,078.56 between the period August 12, 1926 and December 31, 1931.

In many cases allowances have been made to collateral relatives who would not share in the estate of an incompetent in case of her death. These cases are scrutinized carefully by the courts, and the courts are very strict in
915
making allowances to collateral relatives. The test seems to be in such cases, "What would the incompetent do herself if sane?". There is some question as to whether the court should look for the present motive of the incompetent, or what the ordinary reasonable person would do under the circumstances.

In either event, in this particular case, it would seem that the allowance should be made by the Court. There is much proof heretofore outlined of the generous and affectionate attitude of the incompetent toward her two daughters and her grandchildren. The incompetent herhelf made allowances and large gifts to them at a time

916 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.*

when her income was not as large as it is at the present time, and when the incompetent herself kept up large and luxurious homes, both in the country in the north, and in Palm Beach, in the South. There is also considerable evidence to the effect that the incompetent desired at all times to treat her two daughters equally, and to give gifts of money, jewelry and allowances to them, irrespective of their own personal and private means.

The cases where allowances have been refused have been to applicants for allowances, who were collateral
917 relatives and not next of kin, although in many of such instances, where the proof is clear and convincing that the incompetent would have made the allowance if sane, the courts have allowed the same. Matter of Henney, 2 Barb. Chanc. (N. Y.) 326; Re Flagler, 248 N. Y. 415; Matter of Flager, 126 Misc. 764.

In the Matter of Darling, L. R. 39 Ch. Div. 208 (1888), Lord Justice Bowen said, "The court has always considered that its jurisdiction to make allowances to collaterals ought to be exercised with the utmost jealousy. The case of successors to property depends upon a different principal".

918 In this proceeding, the petitioner and the parties to whom she prays an allowance are the successors to the property, and the next of kin, should the incompetent die at the present time, and the persons upon whom the enormous estate of Charles F. Houghton will devolve upon the death of the incompetent, who is the life beneficiary of that estate.

The Court is respectfully referred to a learned note to Matter of Flager, supra, in 59 A. L. R. 653, where the editor sets forth cases in reference to allowances to heirs, to collateral relatives and to strangers to the incompetent.

While the allowances herein asked for may seem large, it is to be borne in mind that the surplus income of the

Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.

919

incompetent is tremendous as mentioned previously, and the courts in the case of next of kin and successors have taken a more liberal view, taking into consideration the size of the estate, the station in life of the incompetent, and her successors, and it may well bear in mind the luxury in which the petitioner was brought up, the many evinced liberalities of the incompetent to her daughters, and her evident desire that gifts should be equalized between the two branches of the family represented on the one hand by her daughter, the petitioner, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and on the other hand, the children of the deceased daughter, who are represented by Ieuan Harris as their guardian.

920

The Special Guardian therefore does not object under the circumstances and proof deduced to the allowances requested in the amended petition.

Respectfully submitted,

CORNELIUS J. SMYTH
Special Guardian of Helen Hall Vail,
Incompetent.

921

922 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 31.*

No. 2867

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.:

I, ARCHIBALD R. WATSON, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, That I have compared the preceding with the original Report of Special Guardian on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of
923 the whole of such original.

Filed. May 23, 1940.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, this 23 day of May, 1940.

ARCHIBALD R. WATSON
County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court,
(Seal) New York County.

924

Plaintiff's Exhibit 32. 925

SUPREME COURT:

COUNTY OF NEW YORK

ACCOUNT

In the Matter

of the

Intermediate Judicial Settlement of the Account of Proceedings of CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, as Committee of the Property of 926

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an Incompetent Person.

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK:

City Bank Farmers Trust Company, Committee of the property of the above named Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, hereby renders the following intermediate judicial account of its proceedings as such Committee from the date of its appointment August 12, 1926 to and including April 1, 1933. 927

The petitioner was known as Farmers' Loan & Trust Company of the City of New York, and assumed its present name on the 28th day of June, 1929.

The petitioner, under its name of Farmers' Loan & Trust Company of the City of New York, was duly appointed Committee of the property of the above named Helen Hall Vail by an order of this Court dated the 12th day of August, 1926, and duly entered in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the 13th day of August, 1926.

928 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.*

The petitioner has not given a bond as such Committee. That by an Order of this Court dated the 12th day of August, 1926, the incompetent's daughter, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, was duly appointed Committee of the Person of the said incompetent, which said Order directed the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, as Committee of the Person of the incompetent, and your petitioner, as Committee of the property of said incompetent, to provide for the said incompetent and see that she is properly cared for in a manner suitable to her means and social
929 position.

That since its appointment as Committee of the property of said incompetent, your petitioner has, in each of the years 1927 to 1933 inclusive, filed in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York, as required by statute, an annual inventory and account of its proceedings as such Committee for the preceding year, and from time to time such annual inventories and accounts have been examined by referee appointed by the presiding justice of the Appellate Division of this Court to examine the inventories and accounts of the committees of incompetent persons.

930 The incompetent is entitled to the income arising from a trust fund created for her benefit under the will of her former husband Charles F. Houghton, deceased.

That by an order of this Court dated the 14th day of January, 1927, and duly entered in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the same day, your petitioner, as Committee of the property of the said incompetent, was directed to pay out of the income of the said incompetent each year in equal quarterly payments the following sums to the following named persons:

To MaBelle Houghton Plumb, a daughter of the said incompetent the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000).

To Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H. Harris,

Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.

William R. Harris and David F. Harris, granchildren of the incompetent, the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000). 931

To Edward Hageman Hall, a brother of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000).

To Mary Hall Taft, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000).

To Elizabeth Hall Burdick, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000).

To Abbe Ferrin, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000).

To Lucy Hall Ferris, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000). 932

That by an order of this Court dated the third day of June, 1932, and duly entered in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the same day, your petitioner, as Committee of the property of said incompetent, was directed to pay to said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, in addition to the annual allowance hereinabove referred to, the sum of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250) quarterly and to said Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of said John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, in addition to the annual allowance hereinabove referred to, the sum of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250) quarterly. 933 Said order further directed your petitioner to pay to said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and to said Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian as aforesaid, the sum of One Hundred Thirty-One Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($131,259) each, representing a payment of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars ($25,000) per annum for the past five years and of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250), the quarterly installment due March 31, 1932 of additional allowances as ordered by said order. That pursuant to said order this Court dated January 14,

934 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.*

1927, and said order of this Court dated June 3, 1932, said allowances and additional allowances are now being paid by your petitioner, except the allowances to said Elizabeth Hall Burdick, who died on March 25, 1933, and Abbe Ferrin, who died on September 6, 1927.

That the incompetent owns real estate consisting of a residence and grounds situated at Geneva, County of Ontario, in the State of New York, and a winter residence situated at Palm Beach, County of Palm Beach, in the State of Florida. That your petitioner, as such Commit-
935 tee, has been required to expend large sums for the maintenance and upkeep of said parcels of real estate, as well as for the taxes and other charges thereon. That your petitioner in this account seeks the approval of the Court as to all expenditures heretofore made in and about the maintenance and upkeep of said parcels of real estate, and also prays that the Court will fix an annual sum for the future maintenance and upkeep of said parcels of real estate which may be expended by your petitioner for such purposes.

SCHEDULE "A" hereto attached contains a full and true statement and description of each article or item of real
936 or personal property and the value thereof, and each sum of money, either principal or interest of Helen Hall Vail, incompetent, which were received by the Committee on its appointment.

SCHEDULE "A-1" hereto attached contains a statement showing the increase of principal since the appointment of Committee from sales of securities, personal property and from other sources.

SCHEDULE "A-2" hereto attached contains a statement showing increase of the principal by reason of sales of real estate and from other sources affecting real estate.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.

937

SCHEDULE "B" hereto attached contains a statement of all sums received on the sale of real and personal property in the principal account and from other sources.

SCHEDULE "B-1" hereto attached contains a statement of all investments made of the principal fund.

SCHEDULE "B-2" hereto attached contains a statement of the purchases of real estate for the principal fund.

SCHEDULE "B-3" hereto attached contains a statement of all changes of investments made, redeemed or paid off 938
affecting the principal account.

SCHEDULE "C" hereto attached contains a statement of expenses of administration chargeable to Principal Account.

SCHEDULE "D" hereto attached contains a statement of all receipts of income not including rent.

SCHEDULE "D-1" hereto attached contains a statement of all income received from real estate.

SCHEDULE "D-2" hereto attached contains a statement 939
showing gains or losses realized on sales of securities purchased for the income account.

SCHEDULE "E" hereto attached contains a statement of all investments made by Committee for account of income of said estate.

SCHEDULE "E-1" hereto attached contains a statement of all investments sold or paid off on account of income.

SCHEDULE "F" hereto attached contains a statement of all expenses of administration chargeable to income.

940 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.*

SCHEDULE "F-1" hereto attached contains a statement of disbursements properly chargeable to income incurred in the maintenance of the incompetent person.

SCHEDULE "F-2" hereto attached contains a statement of expenses of administration chargeable against real estate.

SCHEDULE "F-3" hereto attached contains a statement of payments made to beneficiaries chargeable to income, pursuant to order of the Supreme Court.

941

SCHEDULE "F-4" hereto attached contains a statement showing amounts transferred from Income Account for amortization on various bonds.

SCHEDULE "G" hereto attached contains a statement of the condition of the fund on the date of this accounting showing the book value of the various securities purchased by the Committee as corrected by amortization.

SCHEDULE "H" hereto attached contains a statement of the names and places of residence of the next of kin of the said incompetent person.

942

SUMMARY

AS TO PRINCIPAL

The committee charges itself as follows:—

With amount of Schedule "A"	$ 864,228.90
With amount of Schedule "A-1"	362,674.58
With amount of Schedule "A-2"	39,571.00
Total	$1,266,474.48

Plaintiff's Exhibit 32. 943

The committee credits itself as follows:—

With amount of Schedule "B-2"	4,075.00	
With amount of Schedule "C"	35,120.33	39,195.33
Leaving a balance of principal of		$1,227,279.15

As to Income

The committee charges itself as follows:—

With amount of Schedule "D"	$2,886,630.13
With amount of Schedule "D-1"	8,430.10
Total	$2,895,060.23

944

The committee credits itself as follows:—

With amount of Schedule "D-2"	$30,084.44	
With amount of Schedule "F"	660,703.84	
With amount of Schedule "F-1"	121,376.78	
With amount of Schedule "F-2"	175,954.32	
With amount of Schedule "F-3"	993,116.67	
With amount of Schedule "F-4"	177.61	1,981,413.66
Leaving a balance of income of		$ 913,646.57

945

Said Schedules are severally signed on behalf of the Committee of the Property of the Incompetent and form part of this account.

City Bank Farmers Trust Company
as Committee of the Property

By: H. S. Butterweck.
Trust Officer.

April, 1, 1933.

946 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.*

SCHEDULE "F-3"

Containing a statement of payment made to beneficiaries chargeable to income, pursuant to orders of the Supreme Court.

1927		Voucher	No.
Mar. 31	Mary Hall Taft	$ 750.00	956
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	957
	Abbe Ferrin	500.00	958
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	959
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00	960
947	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	961
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	962
July 2	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	963
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	964
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00	965
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	966
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	967
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	968
	Abbe Ferrin	500.00	968A
948 Sept. 30	Mabelle Houghton Plumb	12,500.00	969
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	970
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	971
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	972
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	973
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	974
Oct. 21	New Rochelle Trust Co., Executor estate Abbe Hall Ferrin, being amount of quarterly payment accrued to Sept 6, 1927, date of death	366.67	975

Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.

949

1928		Voucher	No.
Jan. 3	Mabelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	976
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, Willian R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	977
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	978
	Mary Hall Tafe	750.00	979
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	980
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	981
Mar. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb....	12,500.00	982
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, Willian R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	983
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	984
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	985
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	986
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	987
		$137,616.67	

950

1928	Brought Forward	$137,616.67	
June 29	MaBelle Houghton Plumb ..	12,500.00	988
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, Willian R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	989
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	990
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	991
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	992
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	993
Sept. 29	Mabelle Houghton Plumb....	12,500.00	994
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, Willian R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	995
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	996
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	997
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	998
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	999

951

952 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.*

1928		Voucher	No.
Dec. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1000
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1001
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1002
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1003
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1004
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1005
1929			
953			
Mar. 30	Mabelle Houghton Plumb....	12,500.00	1006
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1007
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1008
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1009
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1010
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1011
June 29	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1012
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and		
954	David F. Harris	12,500.00	1013
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1014
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1015
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1016
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1017
Sept. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1018
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1019
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1020
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1021
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1022
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1023

Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.

955

1929			Voucher	No.
Dec. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...		12,500.00	1024
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris		12,500.00	1025
	Edward Hageman Hall		500.00	1026
	Mary Hall Taft		750.00	1027
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick		500.00	1028
	Lucy Hall Ferris		500.00	1029
			$328,366.67	

956

1930			
	Brought Forward	$328,366.67	
Mar. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1030
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1031
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1032
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1033
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1034
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1035
June 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1036
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1037
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1038
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1039
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1040
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1041
Sept. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb ...	12,500.00	1042
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1043
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1044
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1045
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1046
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1047

957

958 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.*

			Voucher	No.
1930				
	Dec. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1048
		Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1049
		Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1050
		Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1051
		Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1052
		Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1053
1931				
959	Mar. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1054
		Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1055
		Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1056
		Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1057
		Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1058
		Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1059
	June 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1060
		Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1061
		Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1062
960		Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1063
		Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1064
		Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1065
	Sept. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1066
		Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1067
		Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1068
		Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1069
		Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1070
		Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1071
			$519,116.67	

Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.

961

1931	Brought Forward	$519,116.67		
		Voucher	No.	
Dec. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb....	12,500.00	1072	
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1073	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1074	
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1075	
	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1076	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1077	
1932				962
Mar. 31	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	12,500.00	1078	
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	12,500.00	1079	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1080	
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1081	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1082	
Apr. 2	Elizabeth Hall Burdick	500.00	1083	
June 21	MaBelle Houghton Plumb pursuant to order of Supreme Court, New York County, dated June 3, 1932	131,250.00	1084	
22	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris William R. Harris and David F. Harris a/c of $131,250. due pursuant to order of Supreme Court, New York County, dated June 3, 1932	95,000.00	1085	963
30	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1086	
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1087	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1088	
July 1	MaBelle Houghton Plumb, a/c of $12,500. due June 30, 1932 pursuant to order of Supreme Court, New York County, dated January 14, 1927	8,385.00	1089	

964 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 32.*

			Voucher	No.
	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, a/c of $12,500. due June 30, 1932 pursuant to order of Supreme Court		8,385.00	1090
965	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, pursuant to order of Supreme Court, New York County, dated June 3, 1932, balance of $131,250		36,250.00	1091
28	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, balance due on payment of June 30, 1932	4,115.00		
966	Additional allowance per Court Order dated June 3, 1932	6,250.00	10,365.00	1092
	Mabelle Houghton Plumb, balance due on payment of June 30, 1932.	4,115.00		
	Additional allowance per Court Order dated June 3, 1932	6,250.00	10,365.00	1093

Plaintiff's Exhibit 32. 967

		Voucher	No.	
ept. 30	MaBelle Houghton Plumb....	18,750.00	1094	
30	Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	18,750.00	1095	
		$912,866.67		
1932	Brought Forward	$912,866.67		
ept. 30	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1096	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1097	968
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1098	
ec. 31	Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	18,750.00	1099	
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	18,750.00	1100	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1101	
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1102	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1103	
1933				
ar. 31	Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris	18,750.00	1104	969
	MaBelle Houghton Plumb...	18,750.00	1105	
	Edward Hageman Hall	500.00	1106	
	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	1107	
	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	1108	
		$993,116.67		

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY
as Committee of the Property

By: H. S. BUTTERWECK
Trust Officer.

970 **Plaintiff's Exhibit 33.**

SUPREME COURT:

COUNTY OF NEW YORK

SUPPLEMENTAL ACCOUNT OF PROCEEDINGS FROM
April 1, 1933 to July 1, 1933

In the Matter

of the

971 Intermediate Judicial Settlement of the Account of Proceedings of CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, as Committee of the Property of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an Incompetent Person.

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK:

City Bank Farmers Trust Company, Committee of the property of the above named Helen Hall Vail, an in-
972 competent person, hereby renders the following supplemental account of its proceedings as such Committee from the 1st day of April, 1933 to the 1st day of July, 1933:

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "A-1" hereto attached contains a statement showing the increase of principal since the date of its account from sales of securities, personal property and from other sources.

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "B" hereto attached contains a statement of all sums received on the sale of real and personal property in the principal account and from other sources, since the date of its account.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 33.

973

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "B-3" hereto attached contains a statement of all changes of investments made, redeemed or paid off affecting the principal account, since the date of its account.

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "D" hereto attached contains a statement of all receipts of income not including rent, since the date of its account.

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "F" hereto attached contains a statement of all expenses of administration chargeable to income, since the date of its account.

974

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "F-1" hereto attached contains a statement of disbursements properly chargeable to income incurred in the maintenance of the incompetent person, since the date of its account.

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "F-2" hereto attached contains a statement of expenses of administration chargeable against real estate, since the date of its account.

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "F-3" hereto attached contains a statement of payments made to beneficiaries chargeable to income, pursuant to orders of the Supreme Court.

975

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "G" hereto attached contains a statement of the condition of the fund on the date of this accounting, July 1, 1933.

976 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 33.*

The following is a summary statement of this supplemental account:

As to Principal

The committee charges itself as follows:

With amount of Schedule "A"		$ 864,228.90
With amount of Schedule "A-1"		362,674.58
977 With amount of Supplemental Schedule "A-1"		285.00
With amount of Schedule "A-2"		39,571.00
Total		1,266,759.48

The committee credits itself as follows:

With amount of Schedule "B-2"	$4,075.00	
With amount of Schedule "C"	35,120.33	39,195.33
Leaving a balance of principal of		$1,227,564.15

978

As to Income

The committee charges itself as follows:

With amount of Schedule "D"	$2,386,630.13
With amount of Supplemental Schedule "D"	46,775.67
With amount of Schedule "D-1"	8,430.10
Total	$2,941,835.90

Plaintiff's Exhibit 33.

979

Brought forward		$2,941,835.90
The committee credits itself as follows:		
With amount of Schedule "D-2"	$30,084.44	
With amount of Schedule "F"	660,703.84	
With amount of Supplemental Schedule "F"	55,998.24	
With amount of Schedule "F-1"	121,376.78	
With amount of Supplemental Schedule "F-1"	3,992.05	980
With amount of Schedule "F-2"	175,954.32	
With amount of Supplemental Schedule "F-2"	4,283.83	
With amount of Schedule "F-3"	993,116.67	
With amount of Supplemental Schedule "F-3"	1,750.00	
With amount of Schedule "F-4"	177.61	
		2,047,437.78 981
Leaving a balance of income of		$ 894,398.12

Said Supplemental Schedules are severally signed on behalf of the Committee of the Property of the Incompetent and form part of this account.

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY
as Committee of the Property

By C. REGINALD OATES
Trust Officer.

July 1, 1933.

982 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 33.*

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE "F-3."

Containing a statement of payments made to beneficiaries chargeable to income, pursuant to orders of the Supreme Court.

1933		Voucher.	No.
June 30	Edward Hagemann Hall	$ 500.00	S-39
30	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00	S-40
983 30	Mary Hall Taft	750.00	S-41
		$1,750.00	

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY
as Committee of the Property

By C. REGINALD OATES
Trust Officer.

984

Plaintiff's Exhibit 35.

985

At a Special Term of the Supreme Court, Part 1, thereof, held in and for the County of New York in the Court House in the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 19th day of February, 1934.

resent: Hon. ALFRED FRANKENTHALER, Justice.

JUDGEMENT

986

In the Matter

of the

ntermediate Judicial Settlement of the Account of Proceedings of CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, as Committee of the Property of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an Incompetent Person.

987

The above named City Bank Farmers Trust Company aving heretofore presented to this Court its petition in is matter, duly verified the 25th day of April, 1933, raying leave to be allowed to render and file its Interediate Judicial Account as Committee of the Property f the above named Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent perm, from the time of its appointment as such committee order of this Court dated the 12th day of August, 1926, and including the 1st day of April, 1933; and this ourt having by an order dated the 9th day of May, 33, permitted the petitioner to render and file its said ntermediate Judicial Account, and having thereby apointed John A. Mullen, Esq., Special Guardian of the

988 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 35.*

said incompetent person for the protection of her rights and interests in this proceeding, and having also provided that notice of the filing of said account and of the petitioner's application for the judicial settlement thereof, and for the appointment of a Referee to take and state the same, should be given to the next of kin of said incompetent person named in said order personally or by mailing copies of such notice, and also to MaBelle Houghton Plumb, as Committee of the Person of said incompetent, as by reference to said order will more particularly
989 appear; and said order having designated J. Rhodes O'Reilly, Esq., as a person to be served with notice of the filing of the said account and of the application for the judicial settlement thereof, and for the appointment of a Referee to take and state the said account in behalf of all the infants herein; and said order having dispensed with the service of such notice and application upon the said incompetent; and said petitioner having thereafter, in pursuance of said order last mentioned, filed its Intermediate Judicial Account of its proceedings from the date of its appointment, as aforesaid, to and including the 1st day of April, 1933, in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York, and having also given due notice of the
990 filing thereof and of its said application to all the parties in interest herein, as provided in said order dated May 9th, 1933; and the petitioner having duly asked leave of this Court to file a Supplemental Account of its proceedings from the 1st day of April, 1933 to the 1st day of July, 1933, and for the appointment of a Referee to take and state the Intermediate Judicial Account and Supplemental Account of the petitioner and to report to the Court his opinion thereon as to all matter embraced in said account and supplemental account; and this Court by an order dated the 3rd day of August, 1933, having granted permission to the said petitioner to file a Supple-

mental Account of its proceedings, as aforesaid, and having appointed J. Rhodes O'Reilly, Esq., as Referee, as aforesaid; and this Court having by its three orders, each dated the 22nd day of June, 1933, appointed Frederick P. King, Esq., Special Guardian of the infants John H. Harris, William R. Harris, David F. Harris and Joseph H. Plumb, Jr., for the purpose of protecting their rights and interest in this proceeding; and the petitioner having duly filed its Supplemental Account in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the 11th day of August, 1933, and the said Special Guardians, John A. Mullen, Esq., and Frederick P. King, Esq., having duly qualified as such, and the said Referee having given due notice of the hearing in this proceeding to be held before him on the 3rd day of November, 1933, at 10 o'clock A. M., and having examined the witnesses presented by the parties hereto, and having taken and stated the account and supplemental account of said petitioner; and the said Frederick P. King, Esq., as such Special Guardian, having reserved the right to file objections to said account and said supplemental account, and the said Referee having fixed the 8th day of December, 1933 as the day upon which the right to file objections to the account and supplemental account should expire, and no objections having been filed to said account and supplemental account, and the said Referee having duly made his report as such Referee, dated the 16th day of January, 1934 and said report having been duly filed in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York; and a copy of said report having been duly served upon said John A. Mullen, Esq., and Frederick P. King, Esq., Special Guardians, as aforesaid, with notice of the filing thereof; and no exceptions having been filed to said report, as shown by the certificate of the Clerk of said Court, filed herewith; and notice of this motion having been duly served upon John A. Mullen, Esq.,

991

992

993

994 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 35.*

Special Guardian of said incompetent person, and upon Frederick P. King, Esq., Special Guardian of said infants;

NOW, on the said report of said Referee and all the papers and proceedings heretofore filed and had herein, and on reading and filing said notice of motion, with proof of the due service thereof, as aforesaid, the affidavit of John A. Mullen, Esq., verified the 13th day of February, 1934, the affidavit of Frederick P. King, Esq., verified the 25th day of January, 1934, the affidavit of Thomas T.
995 Grace, Esq., verified the 13th day of February, 1934, and the affidavit of J. Rhodes O'Reilly, Esq., the Referee herein, verified the 9th day of February, 1934, and after hearing John S. Montgomery, Esq., of counsel for the petitioner, John A. Mullen, Esq., the Special Guardian of said incompetent person, and Frederick P. King, Esq., the Special Guardian of the infants herein, and on motion of Montgomery, Peabody, Grace & Derby, Esqs., attorneys for the petitioner, it is

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, as follows:

1. That the said report of said Referee be and the same
996 hereby is in all respects ratified and confirmed.

2. That the payments made by the petitioner as Committee of the Property of said incompetent, as set forth in said account and supplemental account, and also the retention by the petitioner of its commissions as Committee on monies received and paid out by it as stated in said account and supplemental account, are hereby all approved, ratified and confirmed.

3. That the investments made by the petitioner as Committee of the Property of said incompetent person, as shown by said account and supplemental account, are all

Plaintiff's Exhibit 35.

997

hereby ratified and approved as proper to be made by it, and they are also all of them approved as proper for it to retain as such Committee.

4. That the said account and supplemental account of said Committee filed herein, as aforesaid, respectively duly verified on its behalf on the 2nd day of June, 1933 and the 7th day of August, 1933, contain a true, just, proper and correct statement and account of all its acts and proceedings as such Committee from the date of its appointment to the 1st day of July, 1933, and a correct and true itemized statement of the receipts and disbursements of any and all monies and properties that have come into the hands of said Committee covering the whole of said period, or with which the Committee is chargeable; that said account and supplemental account are correct in all respects and that said account and supplemental account are hereby judicially approved, settled, adjusted, determined and fixed in all respects as made and filed herein.

998

The following is a Summary Statement of the Account and Supplemental Account:

As to Principal

999

The Committee is charged as follows:

With amount of Schedule "A" (Account) as corrected by testimony in the hearing	$ 869,354.65
With amount of Schedule "A-1" (Account)	362,674.58
With amount of Schedule "A-1" (Supplemental Account)	285.00
With amount of Schedule "A-2" (Account)	39,571.00
Total	$1,271,885.23

1000 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 35.*

The Committee is credited as follows:

With amount of Schedule "B-2" (Account)	4,075.00	
With amount of Schedule "C" (Account)	35,120.33	39,195.33
Leaving a balance of principal of (Supplemental Account)		$1,232,689.90

1001

As to Income

The Committee is charged as follows.

With amount of Schedule "D" (Account)	$2,886,630.13
With amount of Schedule "D" (Supplemental Account)	46,775.67
With amount of Schedule "D-1" (Account)	8,430.10
Total	$2,941,835.90

The Committee is credited as follows:

1002

With amount of Schedule "D-2" (Account)	30,084.44	
With amount of Schedule "F" (Account)	660,703.84	
With amount of Schedule "F" (Supplemental Account)	55,998.24	
With amount of Schedule "F-1" (Account)	121,376.78	
With amount of Schedule "F-1" (Supplemental Account)	3,992.05	

Plaintiff's Exhibit 35.

1003

With amount of Schedule "F-2" (Account)	175,954.32	
With amount of Schedule "F-2" (Supplemental Account)	4,283.83	
With amount of Schedule "F-3" (Account)	993,116.67	
With amount of Schedule "F-3" (Supplemental Account)	1,750.00	
With amount of Schedule "F-4" (Account)	177.61	2,047,437.78
Leaving a balance of income of (Supplemental Account)		$ 894,398.12

1004

5. There is hereby allowed to the petitioner as Committee, as aforesaid, the sum of $12,656.88, as and for the one-half commission which it is entitled to for receiving the capital, and it is allowed as one-half commission for paying out of principal the sum of $35,122.30, the sum of $398.40, which said sums the petitioner as such Committee is hereby authorized to pay to itself out of the capital of said estate, and the said Committee is hereby authorized to retain and pay to itself out of the income of said estate the sum of $4,430.37, being the balance of commissions, at the statutory rate, for receiving and paying out the income received and paid by it from the date of its appointment to the 1st day of July, 1933.

1005

6. That there is hereby allowed to the petitioner as Committee, as aforesaid, the sum of $925.06, for the costs and disbursements of its said attorneys, as stated in the said affidavit of Thomas T. Grace, Esq.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 35.

1006

7. The petitioner is hereby ordered and directed to pay out of the income of the estate of said incompetent, to J. Rhodes O'Reilly, Esq., the sum of $10,000.00, as and for the reasonable fee and compensation of said J. Rhodes O'Reilly, as Referee in this proceeding: to John A. Mullen, Esq., the sum of $8,500.00, as and for his reasonable fee and compensation herein as Special Guardian of the incompetent, and to Frederick P. King, Esq., the sum of $11,100., as and for his disbursements, reasonable fee and compensation as Special Guardian for the infant persons in this proceeding.

1007 On making the said payments, the said petitioner, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, the Committee of the Property of said Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, is hereby released and forever discharged from any and all liability, responsibility and accountability to said incompetent person, or to her estate, or to her next of kin, or any of them by reason of the acts and doings of said Committee down to and including the 1st day of July, 1933.

Enter

A. F.

1008 J. S. C.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 35. 1009

No. 2878.

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.:

I, ARCHIBALD R. WATSON, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, That I have compared the preceding with the original Judgment on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of the whole of such original. 1010

Filed. February 20, 1934.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, this 23 day of May, 1940.

(Seal)

ARCHIBALD R. WATSON
County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court,
New York County.

1011

1012 **Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.**

SUPREME COURT:

COUNTY OF NEW YORK

ACCOUNT

IN THE MATTER

of the

1013 Final Judicial Settlement of the Account of Proceedings of CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, as Committee of the Property of

HELEN HALL VAIL,

an Incompetent Person.

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK:

City Bank Farmers Trust Company, Committee of the property of the above named Helen Hall Vail, formerly an incompetent person, hereby renders the following final
1014 judicial account of its proceedings as such Committee from July 1st, 1933 to and including December 27, 1935, the date of the death of said incompetent.

The petitioner was known as Farmers' Loan & Trust Company of the City of New York, and assumed its present name on the 28th day of June, 1929.

The petitioner, under its name of Farmers' Loan & Trust Company of the City of New York, was duly appointed Committee of the property of the above named Helen Hall Vail by an order of this Court dated the 12th day of August, 1926, and duly entered in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the 13th day of August, 1926.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.

1015

The petitioner has not given a bond as such Committee. That by an Order of this Court dated the 12th day of August, 1926, the incompetent's daughter, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, was duly appointed Committee of the Person of the said incompetent, which said Order directed the said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, as Committee of the Person of the incompetent, and your petitioner, as Committee of the property of said incompetent, to provide for the said incompetent and see that she was properly cared for in a manner suitable to her means and social position.

That since its appointment as Committee of the property 1016
of said incompetent, your petitioner has, in each of the years 1927 to 1934 inclusive, filed in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York, as required by statute, an annual inventory and account of its proceedings as such Committee for the preceding year, and from time to time such annual inventories and accounts have been examined by referee appointed by the presiding justice of the Appellate Division of this Court to examine the inventories and accounts of the committees of incompetent persons.

That on or about the 19th day of February, 1934, by a final judgment of this Court, the account of your petitioner from August 12, 1926, the day of its appointment, 1017
down to and including the 30th day of June, 1933 was judicially settled and allowed and fixing and adjusting the balance of principal remaining in its hands at $1,232,689.90 and the balance of income at $894,398.12, and said judgment further authorized and directed the Committee to make certain disbursements and expenditures therein set forth.

That the said incompetent, Helen Hall Vail, died on the 27th of December, 1935, intestate, and that City Bank Farmers Trust Company was, by a decree of the Surrogate's Court of Ontario County dated February 10, 1936, duly appointed Administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of the said decedent.

1018 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.*

That by an order of this Court dated the 14th day of January, 1927, and duly entered in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the same day, your petitioner, as Committee of the property of the said incompetent, was directed to pay out of the income of the said incompetent each year in equal quarterly payments the following sums to the following named persons:

To MaBelle Houghton Plumb, a daughter of said incompetent the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000).

To Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H. Harris,
1019 William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000.00).

To Edward Hageman Hall, a brother of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000.00).

To Mary Hall Taft, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000.00).

To Elizabeth Hall Burdick, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000.00).

To Abbe Ferrin, a sister of the incompetent, the sum of Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000.00).

To Luch Hali Ferris, a sister of the incompetent, the
1020 sum of Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000.00).

That by an order of this Court dated the third day of June, 1932, and duly entered in the Office of the Clerk of the County of New York on the same day, your petitioner, as Committee of the property of said incompetent, was directed to pay to said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, in addition to the annual allowance hereinabove referred to, the sum of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250.00) quarterly and to said Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of said John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, in addition to the annual allowance hereinabove referred to, the sum of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250) quarterly.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.

Said order further directed your petitioner to pay to said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and to said Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian as aforesaid, the sum of One Hundred Thirty-one Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($131,250.00) each, representing a payment of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars ($25,000.00) per annum for the past five years and of Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($6,250.00), the quarterly installment due March 31, 1932, of additional allowances as ordered by said order. That pursuant to said order of this Court dated January 14, 1927, and said order of this Court dated June 3, 1932, said allowances and additional allowances are now being paid by your petitioner, except the allowances to said Elizabeth Hall Burdick, who died on March 25, 1933, and Abbe Ferrin, who died on September 6, 1927.

That the incompetent at the time of her death owned real estate consisting of a residence and grounds situated at Geneva, County of Ontario, in the State of New York, and a winter residence situated at Palm Beach, County of Palm Beach, in the State of Florida.

SCHEDULE "A" hereto attached contains a statement of the assets constituting the fund on July 1, 1933, as settled by a judgment of the Supreme Court dated February 19, 1934.

SCHEDULE "A-1" hereto attached contains a statement of all securities belonging to Principal Account, which were sold, and the gain and loss realized therefrom.

SCHEDULE "A-2" hereto attached contains a statement of all sums received on the sale of real and personal property in the Principal Account and from other sources.

SCHEDULE "A-3" hereto attached contains a statement of real property sold belonging to the Principal Account and the gain and loss realized therefrom.

1024 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.*

SCHEDULE "A-4" hereto attached contains a statement of personal property delivered to a distributee.

SCHEDULE "B" hereto attached contains a statement of investments made for the Principal Account.

SCHEDULE "B-1" hereto attached contains a statement of expenses of administration chargeable to Principal Account.

1025 SCHEDULE "C" hereto attached contains a statement of changes in securities in Principal Account by reason of exchanges, stock dividends and additions.

SCHEDULE "D" hereto attached contains a statement of all sums received on the sale of real and personal property in the Income Account and from other sources.

SCHEDULE "D-1" hereto attached contains a statement of changes in securities in Income Account by reason of exchanges, stock dividends and additions.

SCHEDULE "D-2" hereto attached contains a statement
1026 of securities received for Income Account to refund unpaid interest on bonds.

SCHEDULE "D-3" hereto attached contains a statement of all securities belonging to the Income Account, which were sold or redeemed, and the gain or loss realized therefrom.

SCHEDULE "E" hereto attached contains a statement of all investments made by Committee for Account of Income.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.

1027

SCHEDULE "E-1" hereto attached contains a statement of the net decrease resulting from revaluation of securities as of December 27, 1935.

SCHEDULE "F" hereto attached contains a statement of all receipts of income not including rent.

SCHEDULE "G" hereto attached contains a statment of payments made to the beneficiaries chargeable to Income, pursuant to Orders of the Supreme Court.

SCHEDULE "G-1" hereto attached contains a statement 1028
of disbursements properly chargeable to Income, incurred in the maintenance of the incompetent person.

SCHEDULE "G-2" hereto attached contains a statement of disbursements properly chargeable to Income.

SCHEDULE "G-3" hereto attached contains a statement of commissions on income paid to the Committee.

SCHEDULE "H" hereto attached contains a statement of the personal property belonging to Principal and Income Account with its market value as of December 27, 1935 1029
delivered to the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail.

SCHEDULE "H-1" hereto attached contains a statement of the real property that passed to the distributees by reason of the death of Helen Hall Vail.

SCHEDULE "I" hereto attached contains a statement of the names and places of residence of the next of kin of said Helen Hall Vail, the deceased incompetent.

1030 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.*

SUMMARY

AS TO PRINCIPAL

The Committee charges itself as follows:—

With amount of Schedule "A"	$1,227,564.15
With amount of Schedule "A-1"	4,977.64
With amount of Schedule "A-2"	729.40
Total	$1,233,271.19

1031

The Committee credits itself as follows:—

With amount of Schedule "A-3"	$ 8,500.00	
With amount of Schedule "A-4"	3,850.00	
With amount of Schedule "B-1"	15,535.86	
With amount of Schedule "E-1"	184,361.29	
With amount of Schedule "H"	912,194.91	
With amount of Schedule "H-1"	109,250.00	
	$1,233,692 06	
Less cash deficit	420.87	1,233,271.19

1032

AS TO INCOME

The Committee charges itself as follows:—

With amount of Schedule "A"	894,398.12
With amount of Schedule "F"	1,186,093.53
With amount of Schedule "D-2"	6,673.79
Total	$2,087,165.44

Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.

1033

The Committee credits itself as follows:—

With amount of Schedule "D-3"	$ 1,728.48	
With amount of Schedule "E-1"	4,117.05	
With amount of Schedule "G"..	384,750.00	
With amount of Schedule "G-1"	38,807.64	
With amount of Schedule "G-2"	407,668.13	
With amount of Schedule "G-3"	15,666.48	
With amount of Schedule "H"..	1,136,767.27	1,989,505.05
Balance—cash		$ 97,660.39

1034

Said Schedules are severally signed on behalf of the Committee of the Property of the Incompetent and form part of this account.

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY,
as Committee of the Property.

By S. R. WALKER
Trust Officer

April 27, 1936.

1035

1036 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.*

SCHEDULE "G".

A STATEMENT of payments made to the beneficiaries chargeable to Income, pursuant to Orders of the Supreme Court.

1933			
July	1	Paid MaBelle Houghton Plumb ..	$ 18,750.00
		" Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
1037 Oct.	2	As of September 30, 1933 paid Mabelle Houghton Plumb	18,750.00
		As of September 30, 1933 paid Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
		Paid Mary Hall Taft	750.00
		" Edward Hagemann Hall	500.00
		" Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
Dec.	30	" Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
		" Edward Hagemann Hall	500.00
1038		" Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
		" MaBelle Houghton Plumb ..	18,750.00
1934			
Mar.	31	" Edward Hagemann Hall	500.00
		" Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
		" Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris, per decree of Supreme Court 1/14/27	18,750.00
		" MaBelle Houghton Plumb ..	18,750.00

Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.

1039

1934			
June 30	"	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
	"	Edward Hagemann Hall	500.00
	"	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
	"	Mabelle Houghton Plumb ...	18,750.00
Sept. 29	"	Edward Hagemann Hall ...	500.00
	"	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
	"	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
	"	MaBelle Houghton Plumb ...	18,750.00
Dec. 31	"	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
	"	Edward Hagemann Hall	500.00
	"	MaBelle Houghton Plumb ...	18,750.00
	"	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
1935			
Mar. 30	"	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
	"	Edward Hagemann Hall	500.00
	"	MaBelle Houghton Plumb ...	18,750.00
	"	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
June 29	"	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
	"	Edward Hagemann Hall	500.00
	"	MaBelle Houghton Plumb ...	18,750.00
	"	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00

1040

1041

Plaintiff's Exhibit 36.

Sept. 30	"	Lucy Hall Ferris	500.00
	"	Edward Hagemann Hall	500.00
	"	MaBelle Houghton Plumb ...	18,750.00
	"	Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H., William R. and David F. Harris	18,750.00
			$384,750.00

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY
as Committee of the Property

By S. R. WALKER
Trust Officer

Plaintiff's Exhibit 37. 1045

At a Special Term of the Supreme Court, Part I thereof, held in and for the County of New York in the Court House in the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, on the 9th day of December, 1936.

ent: Hon. Louis A. Valente, Justice.

In the Matter 1046

of the

l Judicial Settlement of the Account of Proceedings of City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the Property of

Helen Hall Vail,

an Incompetent Person.

---

e above named City Bank Farmers Trust Company ng heretofore presented to this court its petition in 1047 matter, duly verified the 18th day of February, 1936, ing leave to be allowed to render and file its final unt as Committee of the Property of the above named n Hall Vail, an incompetent person, from the 1st day ıly, 1933, the date of the intermediate account of said mittee, to the 27th day of December, 1935, the date e incompetent's death; and this Court having by an r dated the 30th day of June, 1936, permitted the ioner to render and file its said final account, and ng also provided that notice of the filing of said ac- t and of the petitioner's application for the judicial

1048 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 37.*

settlement thereof, and for the appointment of a referee to take and state the same, should be given to the distributees of said incompetent person named in said order personally or by mailing copies of such notice as by reference to said order will more particularly appear; and said petitioner having thereafter, in pursaunce of said order last mentioned, filed its final account of its proceedings from the date of its intermediate account, as aforesaid, to and including the 27th day of December, 1935, in the office of the Clerk of the County of New
1049 York, and having also given due notice of the filing thereof and of its said application to all the parties in interest herein, as provided in said order dated June 30, 1936; and the petitioner having duly petitioned this court for the appointment of a referee to take and state the final account of the petitioner and to report to the court his opinion thereon as to all matters embraced in said account; and this Court, by an order dated the 17th day of July, 1936, having appointed Albert A. Friedlander, Esq., as Referee, as aforesaid; and this Court having by its order dated the 30th day of June, 1936, appointed Frederick P. King, Esq., Special Guardian of the infants
1050 John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, for the purpose of protecting their rights and interests in this proceeding; and the said Special Guardian, Frederick P. King, Esq., having duly qualified as such, and the said John H. Harris, having become twenty one years of age on the 25th day of July, 1936, and having appeared in this proceeding by Messrs. Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, his attorneys, and the said Referee having given due notice of the hearing in this proceeding to be held before him on the 23rd day of July, 1936, at 2: o'clock P. M., and having examined the witnesses presented by the parties hereto, and having taken and stated the account of said petitioner, and the schedules and

Plaintiff's Exhibit 37.

1051

summary of said account having been amended to comply with the testimony taken at the hearings; and the said Frederick P. King, Esq., as such Special Guardian, and all other parties to this proceeding having stipulated to waive the fixation by the referee of any time to file objections to the account and the service of written notice of the same; and said Special Guardian having filed his report; and no objections having been filed to said account, and the said Referee having duly made his report as such Referee, dated the 20th day of November, 1936, and said report having been duly filed in the office of the Clerk of the County of New York, and a copy of said report having been duly served upon said Frederick P. King, Esq., Special Guardian, as aforesaid, and upon Messrs. Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb and John H. Harris, with notice of the filing thereof; and no exceptions having been filed to said report, and notice of this motion having been duly served upon Frederick P. King, Esq., Special Guardian of said infants, and upon Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, as attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb and John H. Harris;

1052

NOW, on the said report of said Referee and all the papers and proceedings heretofore filed and had herein, and on reading and filing said notice of motion, with proof of the due service thereof, as aforesaid, the affidavit of Frederick P. King, Esq., verified the 24th day of November, 1936, the affidavit of Thomas T. Grace, Esq., verified the 20th day of November, 1936, and the affidavit of Albert A. Friedlander, Esq., the Referee herein, verified the 20th day of November, 1936, and after hearing Thomas T. Grace, Esq., of counsel for the petitioner, Frederick P. King, Esq., the Special Guardian of the infants herein, and Frederick P. King, Esq., of the firm of Dean, King, Smith & Taylor, attorneys for MaBelle

1053

Plaintiff's Exhibit 37.

1054

Houghton Plumb and John H. Harris, and on motion of Montgomery, Peabody, Grace & Derby, Esqs., attorneys for the petitioner, it is

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, as follows:

1. That the said report of said Referee be and the same hereby is in all respects ratified and confirmed.

2. That the payments made by the petitioner as Committee of the Property of said incompetent, as set forth
1055 in said account, and also the retention by the petitioner of its commissions as Committee on moneys received and paid out by it as stated in said account are hereby all approved, ratified and confirmed.

3. That the investments made by the petitioner as Committee of the Property of said incompetent person, as shown by said account are all hereby ratified and approved as proper to be made by it.

4. That the said account of said Committee filed herein, as aforesaid, verified on its behalf on the 23rd day of
1056 June, 1936, as amended, contains a true, just, proper and correct statement and account of all its acts and proceedings as such committee from the date of its preliminary accounting to the 27th day of December, 1935, and a correct and true itemized statement of the receipts and disbursements of any and all moneys and properties that have come into the hands of said Committee covering the whole of said period, or with which the Committee is chargeable; that said account as amended is correct in all respects and that said account as amended is hereby judicially approved, settled, adjusted, determined and fixed in all respects as made and filed herein.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 37. 1057

The following is a Summary Statement of the account, as amended in accordance with the testimony taken at the hearings and with the report of the Referee:

SUMMARY

AS CORRECTED BY TESTIMONY

As to Principal

The Committee charges itself as follows:		
With amount of Schedule "A"		$1,020,725.75
With amount of Schedule "A-1"		4,977.64 1058
With amount of Schedule "A-2"		729.40
		$1,026,432.79
The Committee credits itself as follows:		
With amount of Schedule "A-3"	$ 8,500.00	
With amount of Schedule "A-4"	3,850.00	
With amount of Schedule "B-1"	15,535.86	
With amount of Schedule "E-1"	54,222.14	
With amount of Schedule "H"	910,745.66	
With amount of Schedule "H-1"	34,000.00	
	$1,026,853.66	1059
Less cash deficit	420.87	$1,026,432.79

As to Income

The Committee charges itself as follows:	
With amount of Schedule "A"	$ 894,398.12
With amount of Schedule "F"	1,186,369.29
With amount of Schedule "D-2"	6,673.79
Total	$2,087,441.20

1060 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 37.*

The Committee credits itself as follows:

With amount of Schedule "D-3"	$ 1,728.48	
With amount of Schedule "E-1"	4,117.05	
With amount of Schedule "G"	384,750.00	
With amount of Schedule "G-1"	38,807.64	
With amount of Schedule "G-2"	407,668.13	
With amount of Schedule "G-3"	15,666.48	
With amount of Schedule "H"	1,136,767.27	1,989,505.05
		$ 97,936.15

1061

5. There is hereby allowed to the petitioner as Committee, as aforesaid, the sum of $9,599.90 as and for the one-half commission which it is entitled to for paying out the capital, which said sum the petitioner as such Committee is hereby authorized to pay to itself out of the capital of said estate, and the said Committee is hereby authorized to retain and pay to itself out of the income of said Estate $21438.40 being one-half commission at the statutory rate for paying out the income received and paid by it to the Administrator of the Estate, as shown by Schedule "H".

1062

6. That there is hereby allowed to the petitioner as Committee, as aforesaid, the sum of $655.57, for the costs and disbursements of its said attorneys, as stated in the said affidavit of Thomas T. Grace, Esq., and the further sum of $15,000.00 as and for an allowance to the Committee for its reasonable counsel fee and disbursements in this proceeding.

7. The petitioner is hereby ordered and directed to pay to Albert A. Friedlander, Esq., the sum of $10,000.00 as

Plaintiff's Exhibit 37.

1063

and for the reasonable fee and compensation of said Albert A. Friedlander as Referee in this proceeding; and to Frederick P. King, Esq., the sum of $7,500.00 as and for his disbursements, reasonable fee and compensation as Special Guardian for the infant persons in this proceeding, and to Dean, King, Smith & Taylor the sum of $7,500.00 as and for their reasonable fee and compensation as attorneys for MaBelle Houghton Plumb and John H. Harris.

On making the said payments, the said petitioner, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, the Committee of the 1064
Property of said Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, is hereby directed to pay over the balance thereof, to wit, $26,242.28 to City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, and upon so doing said City Bank Farmers Trust Company as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person, is hereby released and forever discharged from any and all liability, responsibility and accountability to the estate of said incompetent person, or to her distributees, or any of them by reason of the acts and doings of said Committee, and it is hereby directed that the bond of MaBelle Houghton 1065
Plumb, the Committee of the Person of said incompetent person, be cancelled.

Enter

L A V
J. S. C.

1066 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 37.*

No. 2864

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.:

I, ARCHIBALD R. WATSON, County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, That I have compared the preceding with the original Final Order on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of the whole of such original.

1067

Filed. December 9, 1936.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, this 23 day of May, 1940.

ARCHIBALD R. WATSON
County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court,
(Seal) New York County.

1068

Plaintiff's Exhibit 38.

1069

Schedule E of Federal Estate Tax Return Transfers (Omitting Printed Instructions).

(1) Did the decedent make any transfer described in the above first paragraph (including the six subparagraphs)? (Answer "Yes" or "No.") No

(2) Did the decedent, within 2 years immediately preceding his death, make any transfer of a material part of his property without an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth? (Answer "Yes" or "No.") 1070
Yes

(3) Did the decedent, at any time, make a transfer of an amount of $5,000 or more without an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth, but not believed to be includible in the gross estate as indicated in the above first paragraph (including the six subparagraphs)? (Answer "Yes" or "No.") Yes

(4) If the answer to question (3) is "Yes" state date, amount or value, character of transfer, and motive which actuated the decedent in making the transfer: See explanation in Sch. E next page 1071

(5) Were there in existence at the time of the decedent's death any trusts created by him during his lifetime? (Answer "Yes" or "No.") No

Pursuant to application of MaBelle Houghton Plumb, decedent's daughter, the Supreme Court, New York County, made an order dated Jan. 14, 1927, authorizing and directing City Bank Farmers Trust Company (then known as Farmers' Loan and Trust Company), as the duly appointed and acting Committee of the property of the decedent who was at that time an incompetent person, to pay out of the unexpended income of the decedent

1072 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 38.*

(then incompetent), the following sums annually: To MaBelle Houghton Plumb, daughter $50,000; To Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren $50,000; To Edward Hageman Hall, brother $2,000; To Mary Hall Taft, sister $3,000; To Elizabeth Hall Burdick, sister $2,000; To Abee Ferrin, sister $2,000; To Lucy Hall Ferrin, sister $2,000.

Pursuant to a further application made by said MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the Supreme Court, New York County,
1073 made an order dated June 3, 1932, granting additional allowances out of the unexpended income of the decedent (then incompetent) to be paid by said City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee. Said increases were made retroactive for a period of five years, and increased the allowances to said MaBelle Houghton Plumb and the Guardian for the infant grandchildren to the extent of $25,000 per annum each. The total amount of all allowances out of the incompetent's income paid under the said orders of January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932 is $1,377,866.67.

True copies of said orders are attached to this return.

1074 The foregoing allowances made by the Court have been characterized by the Appellate Division as "gifts" and are, therefore, not taxable as transfers or advancements. (See *Matter of Farmers' Loan & Trust Company*, 181 App. Div. 642.)

The Administrator during the time when it was acting as Committee for decedent, who was an incompetent, filed Gift Tax returns in respect to all the above payments made since the effective date of the Gift Tax Act of 1932, and paid the gift taxes thereon, pursuant to a ruling that such payments constitute gifts within the Gift Tax Law.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 38. 1075

Schedule L of Federal Estate Tax Return.

RECAPITULATION

Schedule	*Gross Estate*	*Value*	
A	Real estate	$ 109,260.00	
B	Stocks and bonds (grand total of all pages of this schedule)	1,612,666.00	
C-1	Mortgages, notes, and cash	507,662.65	
C-2	Insurance		
D-1	Jointly owned property		1076
D-2	Other miscellaneous property	162,573.83	
E	Transfers		
F	Powers of appointment		
G	Property previously taxed		
	Total gross estate	$2,392,162.48	

Schedule	*Deductions*	*Amount*	
H	Funeral expenses	$ 1,122.27	
	Administration expenses:		
	Executors' commissions estimated	46,300.00	1077
	Attorneys' fees, estimated	57,500.00	
	Miscellaneous	3,237.67	
I	Debts of decedent	371,712.15	
J-1	Unpaid mortgages		
J-2	Net losses during administration		
	Support of dependents		
K	Charitable, public, and similar gifts and bequests		
	TOTAL DEDUCTIONS, except specific exemption and property previously taxed	$ 479,872.09	

1078 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 38.*

Schedule M of Federal Estate Tax Return.

NET ESTATE FOR TAX IMPOSED BY REVENUE ACT OF 1926—RESIDENT OR CITIZEN

Instructions—This schedule should be used only for the estate of a resident or citizen of the United States, except that if death occurred prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1934 it should not be used for the estate of a nonresident citizen of the United States.

1. Total gross estate.....		$2,392,162.48
1079 2. Total deductions, except specific exemption and property previously taxed.....$479,872.09		
3. Specific exemption	100,000.00	
4. Total deductions, except property previously taxed (item 2 plus item 3).....	579,872.09	
5. Deduction for property previously taxed without proportionate reduction (Schedule G, item c).....		
1080 6. Proportionate reduction (proportion of item 4 that item 5 bears to item 1).....		
7. Net deduction for property previously taxed (item 5 minus item 6).....	000.00	
8. Total deductions (item 4 plus item 7)		579,872.09
9. Net estate (item 1 minus item 8)		$1,812,290.39

Estate of HELEN HALL VAIL.

Date of death, December 27, 1935.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 38. 1081

Schedule N of Federal Estate Tax Return.

NET ESTATE FOR ADDITIONAL TAX IMPOSED BY REVENUE ACT OF 1932—RESIDENT OR CITIZEN

Instructions.—This schedule should be used only for the estate of a resident or citizen of the United States, except that if death occurred prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1934 it should not be used for the estate of a nonresident citizen of the United States.

1. Total gross estate.....		$2,392,162.48	1082
2. Total deductions, except specific exemption and property previously taxed.....	$479,872.09		
3. Specific exemption	40,000.00		
4. Total deductions, except property previously taxed (item 2 plus item 3).....	$519,872.09		
5. Deduction for property previously taxed without proportionate reduction (Schedule G, item e).....			1083
6. Proportionate reduction (proportion of item 4 that item 5 bears to item 1)			
7. Net deduction for property previously taxed (item 5 minus item 6).....			
8. Total deductions (item 4 plus item 7)		519,872.09	
9. Net estate (item 1 minus item 8)		$1,872,290.39	

1084 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 38.*

COMPUTATION OF TAX OF FEDERAL TAX RETURN

1. Gross tax imposed by 1926 act	$116,606.14	
2. Credit for gift tax imposed by 1924 and/or 1932 act.....	0.00	
3. Gross tax less credit for gift tax (1 minus 2).....	$116,606.14	
4. Credit for estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession tax....	93,284.91	
1085 5. Net tax imposed by 1926 act (3 minus 4)		$ 23,321.23
6. Total gross taxes imposed by 1926 and 1932 acts (Tentative Tax, 1932 Act).....	$512,901.64	
7. Gross tax imposed by 1926 act.	116,606.14	
8. Gross additional tax (6 minus 7)	$396,295.50	
9. Credit for gift tax imposed by 1932 act	0.00	
1086 10. Net additional tax (8 minus 9)		396,295.50
11. Total net tax (5 plus 10).....		$419,616.73

Plaintiff's Exhibit 38. 1087

General Information of Federal Estate Tax Return.

Place of death, Central Valley, New York. Did decedent die testate? No.

Cause of death, senility. Length of last illness, over one year.

Date of birth.....Place of birth.....

Business or occupation.....

Business address..... Number of children, one living; two deceased.

Married, single, separated, widowed, or divorced at date of death? Widowed. Were letters testamentary or 1088
of administration granted for this estate? Yes. Date granted, February 10, 1936.

Name and location of court, Surrogate's Court, Ontario County, Canandaigua, N. Y.

To whom granted? (Explain if different from the undersigned person or persons filing return) City Bank Farmers Trust Company, 22 William Street, New York, N. Y.

Did the undersigned person or persons filing return make diligent and careful search for property of every kind left by the decedent? Yes. Did the same undersigned make diligent and careful search for information as 1089
to any transfers of the value of $5,000 or more made by the decedent during his lifetime without an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth? Yes.

Name and address of attorney representing estate, if any: Montgomery, Peabody, Grace & Derby, 1 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y.

1090

Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.

CLAIM

TO BE FILED WITH THE COLLECTOR WHERE ASSESSMENT WAS MADE OR TAX PAID

The Collector will indicate in the block below the kind of claim filed, and fill in the certificate on the reverse side.

☐ REFUND OF TAX ILLEGALLY COLLECTED.

1091 ☐ REFUND OF AMOUNT PAID FOR STAMPS UNUSED, OR USED IN ERROR OR EXCESS.

☐ ABATEMENT OF TAX ASSESSED (not applicable to estate or income taxes).

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.:

Name of taxpayer City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Administrator of all the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, late of Geneva, County of On-
1092 tario, New York.

Business address 22 William Street New York New York

Residence .....

The deponent, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that this statement is made on behalf of the taxpayer named, and that the facts given below are true and complete:

1. District in which return (if any) was filed 28th New York

Plaintiff's Exhibit 39. 1093

2. Period (if for income tax, make separate form for each taxable year) from ....., 19.., to .....,19..
3. Character of assessment or tax Estate Tax
4. Amount of assessment, $466,912.27; date of payment 6/22/38 $436,031.67 Tax $30,880.60 Interest
5. Date stamps were purchased from the Government .....
6. Amount to be refunded $466,912.27 $.....
7. Amount to be abated (not applicable to income or estate taxes) ..... $.....
8. The time within which this claim may be legally filed expires, under Section 319 of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended on June 23, 1941. 1094

The deponent verily believes that this claim should be allowed for the following reasons:

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue erroneously and unlawfully claiming authority under the provisions of Section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, has included in the decedent's gross estate the sum of $1,377,866.67, being the aggregate of certain allowances paid by the Committee of the property of the decedent, an incompetent person, during her lifetime, pursuant to two orders of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, in New York County, one dated January 14, 1927, and the other dated June 3, 1932. 1095

The allowances so paid were not transfers in contemplation of death and were not and are not within the purview and scope and meaning of Section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, for the following reasons:

City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as
Administrator of all the goods, chattels

1096 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.*

and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, late of Geneva, County of Ontario, New York.

By P. A. MILLER
Trust Officer

(Corporate Seal)

Sworn to and subscribed before me this
7th day of July 1938.

1097 WILLIAM F. GERLACH
Notary Public,
Bronx County
Bronx County Clerk's No. 225, Reg. No. 216-C-40
New York County Clerk's No. 952, Reg. No. 0-G-574
Westchester County Certificate filed
My Commission expires March 30, 1940
(Notarial Seal)

1. The said allowances paid by the Committee were not paid at the instance or request of the decedent, who theretofore, in appropriate proceedings duly had in the
1098 Supreme Court of the State of New York, had been adjudged to be an incompetent person, incapable of governing herself and of managing her affairs and property.

2. The allowances were made by the Supreme Court of the State of New York in the exercise of power inherent in it as a court of equity and not in the exercise of authority derivative from the incompetent. Even a court of equity, in the guardianship which it exercises over incompetent persons and their estates, may not undertake the testamentary disposition of their property. This is governed by the statutory law of descent and distribution.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.

1099

3. Testamentary motive, which is essential to a gift in contemplation of death, cannot by any provision of positive law be attributed to a person who has been adjudged to be incompetent to manage herself and her affairs. A tax based upon a presumption so arbitrary and opposed to fact illegally deprives those interested in this estate of their property without due process of law guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States and its amendments.

4. The allowances were made pursuant to law out of the surplus income of the incompetent to her daughter and grandchildren after proceedings duly had in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, wherein the incompetent was represented by Special Guardian, and wherein it was found that the incompetent when sane was accustomed to make gifts to her daughters for purposes associated with life and that these allowances would have been made by her had she been in possession of her faculties. 1100

5. The Supreme Court of the State of New York had jurisdiction to make the allowances and its determination of their propriety is conclusive against the world. 1101

6. The fact that the decedent died intestate negatives any statutory presumption that the allowances, or any part of them, can have the character of gifts in contemplation of death. As testamentary motive was not evinced by the decedent when she was sane, it is absurd to attribute such a character to allowances made by the Court after she became insane.

7. As the orders made by the Supreme Court of the State of New York were unconditional, the allowances

1102 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.*

are not to be characterized as advancements, but even if they are viewed as such, they are nevertheless not taxable as gifts in contemplation of death.

8. With respect to such of the allowances as were paid subsequent to the enactment of the Gift Tax Act of 1932, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has assessed and collected gift taxes upon such payments upon the theory that their legal status was that of gifts inter vivos made by the decedent during her lifetime. The Commissioner
1103 is now estopped to include the amount of these payments or any part of them in decedent's gross estate as transfers in contemplation of death.

Gift taxes assessed and paid upon the said allowances are as follows:

Calendar Year	Amount
1932	$18,525.00
1933	10,925.00
1934	12,350.00
1935	14,475.00
1104	$56,275.00

The said administrator has instituted an action against the Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second United States Collection District of New York, for the recovery of the amount of the gift taxes so paid. In the event of a final judicial determination that said gift taxes were legally assessed, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Administrator as aforesaid, hereby reserves the right to file a supplemental claim for refund of gift tax credit pursuant to Section 301(b) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, and Section 402(b) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 39. 1105

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Helen Hall Vail died on December 27th, 1935, intestate, a resident of Geneva, in the County of Ontario, State of New York. On February 10, 1936, Letters of Administration of all her goods, chattels and credits were duly granted and issued by the Surrogate's Court in the County of Ontario, New York, to the City Bank Farmers Trust Company of 22 William Street, New York, N. Y., as administrator. Said City Bank Farmers Trust Company duly qualified as such administrator and at all times since has acted and is now acting as such administrator. Said 1106
administrator heretofore filed in the Office of the Collector of Internal Revenue at Buffalo, New York, an Estate Tax Return on Form 706 for said estate, and in view of the foregoing no further evidence of its authority to act herein accompanies this claim.

The allowances were paid under the following circumstances:

In and by an inquisition as to the competency of Helen Hall Vail, taken by a Sheriff's Jury of New York County on the 11th day of August, 1926, in a proceeding duly instituted for that purpose, the said Jury found, among other things as follows: 1107

> "That the said HELEN HALL VAIL, for at least twelve months last past has been and now is a lunatic, suffering from cerebral arterio-sclerosis, with dementia, hallucinations, and senile arterio-sclerotic chorea, together with lack of insight and proper appreciation of her affairs and impairment of business judgment, and by reason thereof she is incapable of governing herself and managing her affairs and property, and incapable of properly taking care of her person, affairs and property. That the above condition still continues to exist at the present time."

1108 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.*

By an order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York in New York County dated August 12, 1926, the findings of said Sheriff's Jury were in all respects ratified, approved and confirmed, and The Farmers' Loan and Trust Company (now City Bank Farmers Trust Company) was duly appointed Committee of the Property and Estate of said Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent.

Thereafter and on or about the 12th day of November, 1926, application was made to the Supreme Court of the State of New York in New York County by MaBelle
1103 Houghton Plumb, a daughter of the incompetent, for the payment annually to persons named in her petition, *from the surplus income* received by the Committee, such allowances as to the Court should seem reasonable and proper. Upon the said petition, a referee was appointed to take proof of the facts and report thereon to the Court. In and by the report of the said Referee, it was, among other things, found that the said Helen Hall Vail was then 71 years of age; that she was the owner of certain real and personal property mentioned in the report, and was the life beneficiary of a trust created under the Last Will and Testament of Charles F. Houghton, deceased,
1110 her first husband, the annual income of which, for four or five years next preceding, had averaged over $300,000.00; "that the Last Will and Testament of said Charles F. Houghton, deceased, directs that upon the death of his wife, the said Helen Hall Vail, his residuary estate be divided into two equal parts, one of said parts to be held for the benefit of his daughter Laura the income to be paid to her during her life, and upon her death, leaving issue, the principal of said part or share to be divided between her issue, share and share alike. The other of said parts to be held for the benefit of his daughter, MaBelle, the income to be paid to her during her life and upon her death, leaving issue, the principal

Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.

1111

of such part or share to be divided between her issue share and share alike."

It further appeared from the report of the Referee that until their respective marriages, Laura Houghton Harris and MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the daughters of the incompetent, made their home with their Mother, who gave to each of them an annual allowance; these contributions were continued after the marriage of her daughters and were increased in amount; to each of them she gave a home of equal value and both before and after the marriage of her daughters, the incompetent manifested a disposition to benefit them by gifts of money and property. Furthermore, that prior to the time when she was judicially declared such, the incompetent had repeatedly and, over a long period of years, evinced kindly feelings toward her brother and sisters by contributing various annual sums to their support and maintenance. The referee further reported that the granting of all the allowances recommended by his report would coincide with the undoubted desires and intentions of the incompetent were she competent, as evidenced by the solicitude and generosity toward the several applicants displayed by her during competency.

1112

It further appeared from the said report of the Referee, that of the children of the incompetent, MaBelle Houghton Plumb was then alive but that her sister Laura, having theretofore married Ieuan Harris, was dead, leaving her surviving three children, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris. The Referee also found that the cost of maintaining the incompetent would fall far short of the sum of $50,000.00 per annum; that the disease, from which she suffered, was progressive in character and the chances of her recovery very slight. The report concluded with the following recommendation:

1113

1114 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.*

"After considering all the facts and circumstances, the advanced years of the incompetent and the incurable nature of her disease, and the fact that the annual income of the incompetent is vastly in excess of the amount required to maintain her in comfort and luxury, I recommend that there be granted annually to MaBelle Houghton Plumb an allowance of $50,000.; to Ieuan Harris, as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris the sum of $50,000., to be applied by him
1115 toward their maintenance and support; to Edward Hageman Hall an allowance of $2,000.; to Mary Hall Taft an allowance of $3,000.; to Elizabeth Hall Burdick an allowance of $2,000.; to Abee Ferrin an allowance of $2,000., and to Lucy Hall Ferris an allowance of $2,000. The Committee should be instructed accordingly."

The foregoing report was in all respects confirmed by order of the Supreme Court, entered in the office of the Clerk of New York County, on the 14th day of January, 1927.

1116 Thereafter and on or about the 26th day of April, 1932, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, the daughter of the incompetent above named, again petitioned the Supreme Court for an increase of the allowances made to herself and the children of her deceased sister, Laura Houghton Harris. Upon her petition, by an order of the Supreme Court in New York County, dated May 4, 1932, a Special Guardian was appointed to appear and defend the proceeding on behalf of the incompetent and a Referee was appointed to take proof upon all questions arising in the proceeding and report to the Court. Thereafter, testimony was taken before the said Referee who made and filed his report, dated the 25th day of May, 1932, wherein

Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.

1117

he found among other things, "That the disease from which the said Helen Hall Vail is suffering is cerebral arterio-sclerosis, with dementia, hallucinations, and senile arterio-sclerotic chorea, and that the same is incurable, and there is no possibility of her ever being able to take care of her property." The Referee further found that after a search made, no will of the incompetent had been discovered and that upon her death, one-half of her property would vest in her daughter, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and the other half in her grandchildren above named. The Referee further found as follows:

1118

> "That no Will of the incompetent having been discovered, the granting of the allowances herein prayed for, cannot interfere with any testamentary plan of the incompetent, and the inference is clear from the past generosity displayed by the incompetent toward your petitioner, and her grandchildren, that the granting of the allowances would be in accord with the intention and desires of the incompetent were she now competent to make them herself."

It further appeared from the report of the Referee that since her commitment, the income of the incompetent had very largely increased and that the unexpended income, since accumulated in the hands of the Committee, amounted to more than $1,000,000.; that the relationship existing between the incompetent and her daughters during her normal life "was characterized by a spirit of generosity evidenced by substantial gifts to them and by many tokens of affection, and a desire on her part to carry out what she conceived to be the wishes of her deceased husband."

1119

Upon the above findings and others included in his report, the Referee recommended that the annual allow-

1120 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.*

ances out of income authorized by the order of January 14, 1927, be increased to $75,000.00 both for MaBelle Houghton Plumb and the children of her deceased sister, Laura Houghton Harris, and that these increases be made retroactive. This report was approved by an order of the Supreme Court, entered in the office of the Clerk of New York County, on the 3rd day of June, 1932, directing payment of allowances as recommended by the Referee.

Thereafter and on or about the 9th day of May, 1933, upon the application of City Bank Farmers Trust Com-
1121 pany, (formerly Farmers Loan and Trust Company), permission was granted to it by the Supreme Court of the State of New York, in New York County, to account as Committee of the Property of said Helen Hall Vail, an incompetent person. In this proceeding, a Special Guardian was appointed by the Court to protect the rights and interests of the incompetent. The accounts filed in this proceeding, (Schedule F-3), embraced the period from August 12, 1926 to July 1, 1933, and reflected all payments made by the Committee pursuant to the orders granting allowances hereinbefore mentioned, dated January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932, in the aggregate
1122 amount of $994,866.67. The proceeding terminated in a judgment of the Supreme Court, dated the 19th day of February, 1934, wherein and whereby it was, among other things, ordered, adjudged and decreed that the payments made by the Committee of the Property of the said incompetent, as set forth in its account and supplemental account, be approved, ratified and confirmed.

The said Helen Hall Vail died on the 27th day of December, 1935, and thereafter, upon the application of City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of her estate, permission was granted to the Committee to make and render its final account, as Committee of the Property of the deceased incompetent person. This order

Plaintiff's Exhibit 39.

1123

directed that notice of the filing of the account be given to all persons interested in the estate. The account filed in this proceeding, Schedule G, embraced the period from July 1, 1933 to the date of death of Helen Hall Vail, December 27, 1935, and reflected all payments made by the Committee pursuant to the orders granting allowances heretofore made, dated January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932, in the aggregate amount of $384,750.00. This proceeding terminated in a judgment of the Supreme Court, dated the 9th day of December, 1936, wherein and whereby it was, among other things, ordered, adjudged and decreed that the payments made by the Committee of the Property of the said incompetent, as set forth in its account, be approved, ratified and confirmed.

1124

Copies of the various Referees' Reports, Court Orders and Judgments referred to in this claim are not attached hereto, for the reason that certified copies thereof were filed in the Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in connection with the protest of the Administrator against a proposed deficiency in Estate Tax, verified December 17th, 1937, upon which protest a hearing was granted on January 7th, 1938. Said documents were submitted under the symbols:

1125

MT-ET-4169-28th New York
Estate of Helen Hall Vail
Date of death—December 27, 1935.

The aforesaid Reports, Court Orders and Judgments are incorporated herein and made a part hereof as though herein fully set forth.

The foregoing claim was prepared by the undersigned, attorneys enrolled to practice before the Treasury Department, and two of the attorneys designated to act in

1126 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 40.*

this matter in a Power of Attorney dated December 17, 1937 and filed in the Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

We know of our own knowledge that the facts stated therein are true, except as to the facts stated therein on information and belief, and as to those facts we believe them to be true.

Dated, New York, N. Y., July 7, 1938.

FREDERICK P. KING,
1127 160 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

JAMES LLOYD DERBY,
One Cedar Street,
New York, N. Y.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 40.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON

Office of
Commissioner of Internal Revenue
Address Reply to
1128 Commissioner of Internal Revenue
and Refer to
MT-ET-4169-28th New York

Estate of HELEN HALL VAIL
Date of death—December 27, 1935.

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY,
Administrator,
22 William Street,
New York, New York.

Nov 3—1937

Sirs:

A deficiency in the Federal estate tax liability of the above-named estate is hereby proposed as the result of

Plaintiff's Exhibit 40.

1129

an examination of the return, Form 706, the revenue agent's report, and other data on file.

If you acquiesce in the proposed deficiency, you are requested to execute and forward the enclosed Form 890, which is a waiver of the statutory restrictions upon the immediate assessment and collection of the deficiency. The submission of the waiver will expedite the closing of the case and will also lessen the accumulation of interest, since the interest period will then terminate thirty days after filing of the waiver or on the date of assessment, whichever is earlier. Should you desire to consent to the 1130
assessment and collection of only a part of the deficiency, the waiver may be executed for such partial amount. The execution of the waiver does not prejudice your right to file a claim for refund of all or any portion of the tax.

The issuance of this notice does not permit a petition to the United States Board of Tax Appeals. However, a protest against the proposed deficiency may be filed within 30 days from the date of this letter. If a hearing is desired in this office, or if no hearing is contemplated, the protest should be filed with this office. If a hearing is desired in the local division, the protest should be filed with the Internal Revenue Agent in Charge, Buffalo Division. A 1131
protest must be filed in duplicate, and (a) present fully the grounds upon which made, supported by the evidence relied upon, and (b) state whether a hearing is desired. Any statements of fact included therein must be under oath.

If the case cannot be closed upon the basis of a waiver, or if a protest is not filed within the specified time, a formal notice of deficiency will be issued under section 308(a) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, and you may then petition the United States Board of Tax Appeals for redetermination of the tax liability.

A copy of this letter is being forwarded to the Internal Revenue Agent in Charge at 200 U. S. Courthouse, Niagara Square, Buffalo, New York.

1132 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 40.*

Examination of the return discloses the following:

	Returned		*Tentatively Determined*	
Gross estate	$2,392,162.48		$3,781,604.15	
Deductions (1926 Act)	579,872.09		566,992.73	
Net estate (1926 Act)	1,812,290.39		3,214,611.42	
Gross estate	2,392,162.48		3,781,604.15	
Deductions (1932 Act)	519,872.09		506,992.73	
Net estate (1932 Act)	1,872,290.39		3,274,611.42	
1. Gross tax (1926 Act)	116,606.14		264,253.37	
2. Credit for gift tax	0.00		0.00	
1133 3. Gross tax less gift tax credit	116,606.14		264,253.37	
4. Credit for estate or inheritance tax	93,284.91		0.00	
5. Net tax (1926 Act)		$23,321.23		$264,253.37
6. Total gross taxes (1926 and 1932 Acts)	512,901.64		1,073,429.02	
7. Gross tax (1926 Act)	116,606.14		264,253.37	
8. Gross additional tax	396,295.50		809,175.65	
9. Credit for gift tax	0.00		0.00	
10. Net additional tax		396,295.50		809,175.65
11. Total net tax		419,616.73		1,073,429.02
Amount assessed as deficiency pursuant to waiver		0.00		419,616.73
Deficiency				653,812.29

1134

The deficiency bears interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from 15 months after the decedent's death to the date of assessment, or to the thirtieth day after the filing of a waiver of the restrictions on the assessment, whichever is the earlier.

The deficiency results from the following adjustments:

GROSS ESTATE

Other Miscellaneous Property	*Returned*	*Tentatively Determined*
Item 1	$23,538.00	$31,913.00

Plaintiff's Exhibit 40.

1135

Additional items:

Solitaire diamond ring 4½ carats	0.00	2,200.00
Canary diamond ring 2½ carats with small diamonds	0.00	1,000.00

Transfers	*Returned*	*Tentatively Determined*
The value of the following described property is included in the gross estate under the provisions of Section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended:		
Payments made from estate pursuant to orders of the Supreme Court, New York County, New York, dated January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932	0.00	$1,377,866.67

1136

1137

DEDUCTIONS

	Tentatively Determined	*Returned*
Administrator's commission	$45,798.25	$46,300.00
Attorneys' fees	46,000.00	57,500.00
Miscellaneous administration expenses: 8th item	0.00	877.61
To balance	$1,402,321.03	

The deduction for administrator's commission is reduced

1138 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 40.*

amount which will be paid according to the affidavit of P. A. Miller, trust officer of the administrator company.

Under miscellaneous administration expenses, the deduction for the 8th item, representing 1936 State, county and city taxes, is disallowed since it appears that these taxes accrued after the date of the decedent's death.

CREDIT

No allowance is made for credit on account of State
1139 estate, inheritance, legacy or succession taxes paid for the reason that the evidence required under Article 9, Regulations 80, has not been submitted. Please advise when the credit evidence may be expected.

If the full eighty per cent credit is allowed, the net deficiency tax will be $442,409.59. Execution of the enclosed waiver as to that amount will enable the Bureau to assess the full amount of the probable net tax and expedite the closing of the case.

Respectfully

1140 D. S. Bliss,
Deputy Commissioner.

Enclosures:
Waiver.
Summary

Plaintiff's Exhibit 41. 1141

80M Rev. June, 1934

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Washington

Apr 5 1938

Office of
Commissioner of Internal Revenue

Address Reply to
Commissioner of Internal Revenue 1142
and Refer to

MT-ET-Cl-4169-28th New York

Estate of Helen Hall Vail
Date of death—December 27, 1935

City Bank Farmers Trust Company, Administrator,
22 William Street,
New York, New York.

Sirs:

A deficiency of $645,654.48 in the Federal estate tax 1143
liability of the above-named estate has been determined after a review of the file in the case and a consideration of the protest against a deficiency proposed in a previous letter from this office. The determination of the deficiency and the action of this office on the protest are fully explained in the attached statement.

This notice of deficiency is given in accordance with the provisions of Section 308 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1926 as amended by Section 501 of the Revenue Act of 1934, and a petition for a redetermination of the deficiency may

1144 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 41.*

be filed with the United States Board of Tax Appeals within 90 days (not counting Sunday or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the ninetieth day) from the date of the mailing of this letter. If you acquiesce in this determination and do not desire to file a petition with the United States Board of Tax Appeals, you are requested to execute and forward the enclosed Form 890, waiving the restrictions on the immediate assessment and collection of the deficiency.

The submission of the waiver will expedite the closing
1145 of this case and will also benefit the estate by preventing the accumulation of interest charges, as the interest period terminates 30 days after the filing of the waiver or on the date of assessment, whichever is earlier. The signing of the waiver does not prejudice your right to file a claim for refund of all or any portion of the tax. If you desire to consent to the assessment and collection of only a part of the deficiency, the enclosed form of waiver should be executed in such partial amount.

If within the 90-day period a petition has not been filed with the United States Board of Tax Appeals or the waiver, Form 890, has not been submitted, the deficiency
1146 will be thereafter assessed.

Respectfully,

GUY T. HELVERING,
Commissioner.

By D. S. BLISS
D. S. Bliss,
Deputy Commissioner.

Enclosures:
Statement,
Waiver, Form 890.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 41. 1147

STATEMENT

The protest relates to the following items:

GROSS ESTATE

Transfers	*Returned*	*Tentatively Determined*	*Determined*
Payments made from the decedent's estate pursuant to the orders of the Supreme Court of New York, dated January 14, 1927, and June 3, 1932	$ 0.00	$1,377,866.67	$1,377,866.67

1148

After a careful review of all of the evidence of record it is held that the above transfers were properly included in the decedent's gross estate under the provisions of section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended.

DEDUCTIONS

1149

Debts of decedent:

Item 2	23,153.39	23,153.39	31,038.30
Item 3	30,000.00	30,000.00	40,655.57

The above items under debts of decedent have been increased to cover the additional amounts paid subsequent to the filing of the return.

1150 *Plaintiff's Exhibit 41.*

The following tabulation shows the Federal estate tax liability of this estate which is hereby made final:

Gross estate		3,781,604.15
Deductions, 1926 Act		585,533.21
Net estate, 1926 Act		3,196,070.94
Net estate, 1932 Act		3,256,070.94
Gross tax, 1926 Act	$ 262,028.51	
1151 Credit for estate or inheritance taxes	0.00	
Net tax, 1926 Act		262,028.51
Total gross taxes, 1926 and 1932 Acts	1,065,271.21	
Gross tax, 1926 Act	262,028.51	
Additional tax		803,242.70
Total net tax		$1,065,271.21
Amount assessed on return		419,616.73
1152 Deficiency		$ 645,654.48

No credit is allowed for either gift tax or State estate, inheritance, legacy or succession taxes at this time as the gift tax has not been finally determined and the inheritance tax credit evidence has not been submitted.

The deficiency bears interest at the rate of six per cent per annum from fifteen months after the decedent's death to the date of assessment, or to the thirtieth day after the filing of a waiver of the restrictions on the assessment, whichever is the earlier.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 43. 1153

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

WASHINGTON

Jul 28 1938

OFFICE OF
COMMISSION OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Address Reply to
Commissioner of Internal Revenue
and Refer to

1154

MT-ET-Ci-4169-28th New York
Estate of Helen Hall Vail
Date of death—December 27, 1935

City Bank Farmers Trust Company, Administrator,
22 William Street,
New York, New York.

Sirs:

Reference is made to the claim filed by you on July 9, 1938, for the refund of $466,912.27 representing a part of the Federal estate tax paid in behalf of the above-named 1155 estate.

In support of the claim it is contended that certain distributions of the decedent's property made pursuant to several orders of the Supreme Court of the State of New York were not made in contemplation of death and therefore the value of the property so distributed should be excluded from the gross estate.

The record shows that the referee found that the decedent, an incompetent person, was of advanced years; that she was suffering from an incurable disease of progressive character; that the chances of her recovery were very

Plaintiff's Exhibit 43.

1156 slight; that the decedent had made no will; and that upon her death her property would vest one-half in her daughter, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, one of the distributees, and one-half in her three grandchildren, the other distributees.

The several reports of the referee were approved by the Supreme Court of New York and the distributions were made pursuant thereto. No showing has been made that the distributees were in need of financial assistance. The action of the court in ordering distribution of the property of an incompetent person is the action of the incompetent.

1157 The facts show that the transfers were made in contemplation of the decedent's death and the value of the property transferred was properly included in decedent's gross estate under the provisions of section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926.

In view of the foregoing, the claim for refund filed by you on July 9, 1938, is hereby rejected.

Respectfully,

GUY T. HELVERING,
Commissioner.

1158

By: D. S. BLISS,
Deputy Commissioner.

Opinion.

1159

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

APPEARANCES:

MONTGOMERY, GRACE & DERBY, for Plaintiff; James Lloyd Derby and J. Seymour Montgomery, Jr., of Counsel. 1160

Hines, Rearick, Dorr & Hammond; John K. Watson and Paul Smith; Moot, Sprague, Marcy & Gulick; Welles V. Moot, of Counsel.

Dean, King, Smith & Taylor; Amicus Curiae, Frederick P. King, of Counsel.

GEORGE L. GROBE, United States Attorney; Robert M. Hitchcock, Assistant United States Attorney, for Defendant.

KNIGHT, District Judge: 1161

This is an action by the plaintiff as administrator of the estate of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, to recover $466,912.27 from the defendant as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-eighth Collection District, New York. Plaintiff, under protest, paid the aforementioned amount, which included interest, on account of the federal estate tax liability in respect to the estate of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, under Section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended. Plaintiff filed a claim for refund, which was rejected by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and thereafter this action was commenced to recover sums paid as aforesaid.

1162 *Opinion.*

The deceased was duly adjudged to be an incompetent person by the Supreme Court of the State of New York in August, 1926, and plaintiff was appointed committee of her property. Thereafter a daughter, MaBelle H. Plumb, petitioned the New York Supreme Court for allowances for herself and others out of the surplus income of the incompetent. By order of the Court, January 14, 1927, the committee was directed to make annual payments of $50,000 to the incompetent's daughter and $50,000 to the guardian of three infant grandchildren and smaller
1163 amounts to collaterals of the incompetent, out of the incompetent's income. The order included a finding of fact that the incompetent would have made such allowances if she had been in possession of her mental faculties. By later order, June 3, 1932, the Court directed the committee to increase the amounts to be paid to the incompetent's daughter and the guardian of three infant grandchildren to the extent of $25,000 per annum and made these increased allowances retroactive to the extent of five and one-fourth years. This order, like the earlier order, was based on a finding that the incompetent would have made such allowances if she had been possessed of her mental faculties. Pursuant to these orders there were
1164 paid out of the surplus income of the incompetent to the persons therein named allowances aggregating the sum of $1,377,866.67.

The Committee of the property of the incompetent, in 1933, filed an intermediate account for the period from August 12, 1926, the date of its appointment, to July 1, 1933, which embraced and reflected all payments made during this period pursuant to the orders of the Court. Thereafter an order was made and entered which approved, ratified and confirmed all the payments made by the Committee, as set forth in its account.

The incompetent, Helen Hall Vail, died on December 27, 1935, and thereafter the Committee rendered a final

1165

account that embraced and reflected all payments made by the Committee for the period July 1, 1933, to December 27, 1935, which was confirmed, ratified and approved by a final judgment of the New York Supreme Court.

There were two sets of objections interposed by the defendant to the introduction of certain evidence on the trial upon which the Court then reserved decision. The first set of objections was to the reception in evidence of certain exhibits of records of the Surrogate's Court of Orlans County purporting to show the fixation of a transfer tax by the State of New York, and also the proceeding upon the intermediate and final accounting of the Committee of the incompetent in the Supreme Court in New York State. The objections are sustained and the evidence given relative thereto excluded upon the ground that the evidence is immaterial. The sense in which it is immaterial hereinafter appears.

1166

The second set of objections relates to the admission of the deposition of Mr. Justice Lydon. While counsel for the plaintiff argues that such testimony is admissible, counsel for the Harris children, appearing amicus curiae, contends that such testimony is inadmissible. There is no claim that the orders of the Supreme Court of the State of New York are in any way ambiguous, and the only purpose of the introduction of the depositions of Justice Lydon is to prove that in the 1927 proceeding the Court had no intent to make a testimentary transfer in contemplation of death. Mr. Justice Ingraham is deceased, so any claim as to his motive in granting allowances must be found in the records of his court. In my opinion the deposition of Justice Lydon is incompetent for any purpose. In so far as the proceedings looking to the payment of the money out of the estate are concerned, the records thereof are the best evidence. There is no claim made of any ambiguity in the records.

1167

1168 *Opinion.*

"The rule under discussion is stringently enforced to forbid the admission of any parol or extrinsic evidence to contradict, impeach, vary, or explain judicial records, especially where the right of third persons acquired under a judgment would be affected. * * * It also precludes the admission of evidence showing the grounds of a judgment, order, or decree, or to show that the grounds on which a judgment was apparently based did not exist, or that a verdict was improper." Corpus Juris, Section 1388, Vol. 22, p. 1077.

1169

The following cases are also in point on the specific question presented: Matter of Fiegler, 248 N. Y. 415; Agan v. Hey, 30 Hun. (N. Y.) 591; Blue Mountain Iron & Steel Co. v. Portner, 131 F. 57; Lyon v. Perin Mfg. Co., 125 U. S. 698; Doyle-Kidd Dry Goods Co. v. Sadler-Lusk Trading Co., 206 F. 813.

This action arises over the interpretation of Section 302 of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended by Section 803(a) of the Revenue Act of 1932; now Section 811 (c) of Internal Revenue Code. So far as material, its provisions are as follows:

1170

"SEC. 811. GROSS ESTATE.

The value of the gross estate of the decedent shall be determined by including the value at the time of his death of all property, real and personal, tangible or intangible, wherever situated, except real property situated outside of the United States—

* * * * * *

(c) Transfers in Contemplation of, or Taking Effect at Death.—To the extent of any interest therein of which the decedent has at any time made a transfer,

1171

by trust or otherwise, in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after his death, or of which he has at any time made a transfer, by trust or otherwise, under which he has retained for his life or for any period not ascertainable without reference to his death or for any period which does not in fact end before his death (1) the possession or enjoyment of, or the right to the income from, the property, or (2) the right, either alone or in conjunction with any person, to designate the persons who shall possess or enjoy the property or the income therefrom; except in case of a bona fide sale for an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth. Any transfer of a material part of his property in the nature of a final disposition or distribution thereof, made by the decedent within two years prior to his death without such consideration, shall, unless shown to the contrary, be deemed to have been made in contemplation of death within the meaning of this subchapter; * * *"

1172

One contention made by the plaintiff is that the statute is to be construed literally and, since Mrs. Vail was an incompetent, there could not have been made any transfer in contemplation of death. Such contention is controverted both by the defendant and counsel for the Harris heirs. It is without merit. The issue is whether the transfers were in contemplation of death within the scope and meaning of the law, and the determination here is to be found in the proceedings had leading to the deduction from the estate of the incompetent. Any question in this regard is answered in the decision in City Bank Farmers Trust Co. v. Hoey, Collector, etc., 23 F. Supp. 831, affirmed 101 F. (2d) 9, relative to the transfers here in question. In the District Court decision, Judge Patter-

1173

son said: "Such payments have the status of gifts made by the incompetent acting through the Court", and Judge Chase on the appeal said: "It is clear, as the parties agree, that the transfers * * * were gifts."

There can be no question that the Supreme Court under its broad powers can make allowances out of the surplus income of an incompetent "upon the theory that the lunatic would, in all probability, have made such payments if he had been of sound mind." Matter of Lord, 227 N. Y. 145; In re Andrews, 192 N. Y. 514; Matter of
1175 Flagler, 248 N. Y. 415; Pomeroy, Equity Jurisprudence, Vol. 1, 4th Ed. (1918) Sec. 384, n. It has not the power to make a will for the incompetent or to say what disposition should be made of the property after death. Ex parte Whitebread, 2 Mer. 99, 35 Eng. Rep. 878 (1816); Matter of Salisbury, 3 Johns Ch. (N. Y.) 347 (1818); Lewis v. Jones, 50 Barb. 645 (N. Y.); and Section 1383 New York Civil Practice Act. Further, undoubtedly the judgment and decrees of the court are presumed to be within the jurisdiction and power of the court. Voorhees v. Bank of the U. S., 10 Pet. 449; Freeman on Judgments, 5th Ed. p., 831, Sec. 387, and it is not likely that the
1176 court would be "party to a scheme to enable a private company to avoid federal taxation." But all this seems beside the point. A finding by the state court that Mrs. Vail would have made a gift of the amounts herein shown does not preclude a finding in this court that those gifts were made in contemplation of death. The rule is stated in Commissioner v. Greene, 119 F. (2d) 383, that "State law may control only when the Federal Taxing Act, by express language or necessary implication, makes its own operation dependent upon State law", and further, "Since local law is not controlling, it is immaterial what local statutes said, or local Courts held."

Opinion.

1177

The purpose of Congress is enacting the taxing statute was to prevent tax evasion. The dominant purpose is to reach substitutes for testamentary dispositions and to prevent evasion of the tax. United States v. Wells, 283 U. S. 102. Obviously without such statutes transfers in any amount could be made at any time and a tax upon succession of interest evaded.

The test of whether or not a donative transfer inter vivos was in contemplation of death, within the meaning of the Revenue Act, is the motive. The differentiation between gifts made in contemplation of death and those not so made "must be found in the transferor's motive." United States v. Wells, supra. Determination that the transfer is in contemplation of death is not dependent on finding that the transferor then entertains thought of death but rather whether the transfer was made in anticipation of succession. United states v. Wells, supra.

1178

Motive means not only purpose but means the measure of the purpose. "It must be a particular concern, giving rise to a definite motive" United States v. Wells, supra. Motive here must be found from the record of the proceedings in the State Courts. The Committee through the action of the court could only do that which it may reasonably be said the incompetent if competent would have done.

1179

Mrs. Vail was adjudicated to be incompetent and a Committee of her property appointed on August 12, 1926. On November 12, 1926, or just two months thereafter, the first application for allowances was made to the Supreme Court. The annual income of the incompetent for four or five years preceding the adjudication of incompetency had averaged $318,000. In 1917 Mrs. Vail gave each of her two daughters a valuable home, and for some years prior to 1926 had made Mrs. Plumb and Mrs. Harris an annual allowance of $6,000. In 1917 she also gave Mrs.

Plumb an additional $5,000. Otherwise there was no variance in the allowance to Mrs. Plumb. She never made an allowance for the benefit of the Harris children or to the collateral heirs. In January, 1927, the first order of the Supreme Court was made directing the payment of $50,000 out of the incompetent's income annually to Mrs. Plumb; to the general guardian of the Harris children $50,000, and to each of five collateral heirs $2,000. On June 3, 1932, the annual allowance to Mrs. Plumb and the guardian of the Harris children was increased to $75,000,
1181 and the increase of $25,000 was made retroactive for a period of 5 and one-quarter years. During those five years the average annual income of the incompetent was approximately $450,000. While it appears that the father of the Harris children had a gross annual income of approximately $200,000, the Referee who passed on the first petition recommended, that the allowance for them be given "to be applied by him—'general guardian' toward their support and maintenance." There is nothing to show the income of Mrs. Plumb's husband, but it does appear that she had an annual income of $150 from some other estate. There is evidence that Mrs. Vail had made
1182 an allowance to a sister, Mrs. Ferris, of approximately $500 annually and given some money and gifts to others of the collaterals at irregular intervals and in varying amounts. Neither petition contains any recital of any need on the part of either Mrs. Plumb or the Harris children.

"Need" is not a necessary element of the motive to be attributed to the incompetent. Neither is age such element. However, both may be taken into consideration in determining motive. Specially should need be considered here where it is urged that these allowances were made in order that the beneficiaries could have greater advantages. Concededly the burden rests upon the plain-

tiff to establish that these gifts were donative and not made in anticipation of the natural succession to the decedent's property or in contemplation of death.

It seems to me that plaintiff has not borne the burden placed upon it; that the evidence does not warrant the conclusion that the incompetent, if competent, would have made these allowances.

Among others, there are these outstanding facts:

(1) When adjudicated incompetent Mrs. Vail was 74 years of age. She was suffering from an incurable ailment. 1184

(2) Mrs. Vail was adjudged incompetent August 12, 1926. Less than two months after such adjudication, to wit, on October 8, 1926, the first petition of Mrs. Plumb for the fixation of allowances was verified.

(3) Allowances of Mrs. Vail to her daughters had never exceeded $6,000 per year to each. In 1912 she gave each $1,500; in 1913, $3,000; and since 1914, $6,000 annually. At one time she did give Mrs. Plumb $5,000 in addition and to each of her two daughters a residence of considerable value. 1185

(4) While the record does not disclose the amount of the estate of Mrs. Vail in 1912, it is clear that it was a large amount, and it had been accumulating from 1897, when her husband died. Yet, as appears, until 1914, the allowances to the daughters did not exceed $3,000 annually to each.

(5) For the five years preceding the adjudication the average annual income from the trust was $318,000, yet during that time the allowance to each daughter did not exceed $6,000.

(6) Since the adjudication the incompetent's income has increased on the average annually not to exceed 23 percent over what it averaged five years preceding adjudication, yet the allowances to the daughters were jumped from $6,000 to $50,000, or 800 per cent.

(7) There is no proof that any allowances were ever made to the collateral heirs, save to Mrs. Ferris to whom an allowance of $500 annually appears to have been paid. Attention is called to the fact that proof of this allowance and proof of gifts to other collaterals is purported
1187 to be made by letters written by relatives of the collaterals to Mrs. Plumb after the adjudication herein was made. Clearly the letters were not competent evidence.

(8) Neither the petition of 1926 nor that of 1932 shows any need on the part of any of the direct or collateral heirs.

(9) The Referee in the 1926 proceeding recommended an allowance of $50,000 to the general guardian of the Harris children to be applied by him to their "maintenance and support." Yet the father of these children had a gross income of $200,000. It is admitted that this
1188 allowance for them was not needed.

(10) The records of the proceedings in 1926 and 1932 clearly show purpose to equalize allowances to direct heirs so that each eventually would share equally in the estate of the incompetent.

(11) The increase in the allowance in 1932 can be supported on no theory save that it was a gift in anticipation of succession to the estate.

(12) The retroactive allowances aggregating $250,000 can be justified as a donative gift on no plausible theory or reason. The making of these allowances did exactly

1189

what one of the attorneys in the proceedings then said that he feared might be the result if a flat increase of $250,000 were made. He said: "It seems to me to be the idea of distributing part of the incompetent's estate in anticipation more or less of her death." Whether this $250,000 was split into five payments or whether it was paid as single payment as of date of order, obviously is of no consequence.

(13) A substantial part of this estate was withdrawn by these allowances. The amount, as heretofore stated, was $1,377,866.67.

1190

(14) The records of both proceedings speak of sums to be obtained as "allowances", and they contain the stipulation of Mrs. Plumb that the ultimate amount she should receive from the estate of the incompetent should not exceed that to be paid the general guardian on account of the Harris children; and these allowances in this connection are spoken of as "advancements." The characterization of such as "advancements" is not conclusive as to motive, but it is important in connection with other factors.

1191

(15) The theory of counsel for the interested parties is expressed in the record before the Referee "that by granting these allowances to the children and grandchildren will be simply giving them what they will eventually get in the end," and "where it is impossible for her (incompetent) to use it by reason of the misfortune of her mental and physical condition, that then this court can make an advancement, and in this case it is proper it should do so." The ideas as above stated are expressed in various comments made by counsel for Mrs. Plumb and for the general guardian.

1192 *Opinion.*

(16) In the 1932 proceedings Mrs. Plumb testified that $50,000 allowance per year was not sufficient to maintain herself and son and to send him to college. It is rather extraordinary statement, but, assuming it to be true, it is no proof that Mrs. Vail would have increased an allowance of $6000 to $75,000 at one time. The allowance fixed in 1932, retroactive as of 1926, in effect increases by 1200 percent the allowance last made by Mrs. Vail to each of the direct heirs.

In City Bank etc. v. Hoey, supra, no question was
1193 raised as regards these gifts being made in contemplation of death. Naturally it would not have been. The court could not then properly have considered any question of intent or motive. The gift tax and the estate tax are "not mutually exclusive in all cases." Hesslein v. Hoey, 91 F. (2d) 954.

As I have examined the numerous cases cited by the plaintiff and the attorney for the guardian of the Harris children as amicus curiae, I find none that present comparable facts. There are so many cases on what constitutes gift made in contemplation of death within the statute, but it would be quite unusual to find two pre-
1194 senting facts which are comparable.

If I had the authority to change the allowances as made by the orders of the state court to the direct heirs by reducing them below $75,000 but exceeding $6000 in some amount, I would be disposed to do so. I do not believe that I have the authority to do so.

Conclusions of Law.

I find and decide that:

1. All sums of money paid to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H. Harris,

1195

William H. Harris and David F. Harris, minor grandchildren of the aforesaid incompetent, and Edward Hageman Hall, Mary Hall Taft, Elizabeth Hall Burdick, Abee Perrin and Lucy Hall Ferris by the Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, and purported to be paid pursuant to an order granted by Hon. Richard P. Lydon, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, on January 14, 1927, were payments made in contemplation of death and succession to the estate of said incompetent, save and except the sum of $6000 paid annually since 1926 to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and Ieuan Harris, as general guardian of John H. Harris, William H. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, and the sum of $500 paid to Lucy Hall Ferris.

1196

2. All sums of money paid to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and Ieuan Harris, general guardian of John H. Harris, William H. Harris and David F. Harris, minor grandchildren of the aforesaid incompetent, and Edward Hageman Hall, Mary Hall Taft, Elizabeth Hall Burdick, Abee Ferrin and Lucy Hall Ferris by the Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, and purported to be made pursuant to an order granted June 3, 1932, by Hon. Felix Ingraham, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, were payments made in contemplation of death and succession to the estate of said incompetent, save and except the sum of $6,000 paid annually to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and Ieuan Harris, as general guardian of John H. Harris, William H. Harris and David F. Harris, grandchildren of the incompetent, and the sum of $500 paid to Lucy Hall Ferris.

1197

The payments aforesaid in the amounts of $6000 and $500 aforesaid were motivated by the same motive which would have lead the incompetent, Helen Hall Vail, to make payments in these amounts to these respective parties.

1198 *Opinion.*

3. Plaintiff is entitled to recover the amount of the tax fixed by law as a tax upon the estate of the deceased, computed on $12,500 per year for each year commencing with 1926 and continuing to December 27, 1935, with interest.

4. The plaintiff is entitled to no recovery herein, except as aforesaid.

If desired, the parties hereto may submit to the court
1199 findings, which upon adoption will be made a part of this opinion.

February 24, 1942.

JOHN KNIGHT,
United States District Judge.

Filed Feb. 25, 1942.

1200

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. 1201

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

The issues in this action having been brought to trial before the Honorable John Knight, United States District Judge, and the parties having waived a trial by jury by not making demand therefor and thereby consenting 1202
to the trial and determination of the cause by the Court without a jury, and all the parties having appeared and the Court having heard the allegations, proofs and arguments of the respective parties, and the Court being fully advised in the premises, and due deliberation having been had, and this Court having made and filed its written opinion dated February 24, 1942, the Court hereby makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I 1203

Plaintiff, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York and having its principal place of business at No. 22 William Street, Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, and is the duly appointed, acting and qualified administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, late a citizen and resident of the State of New York, who died intestate on December 27, 1935.

1204 *Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.*

II

The defendant, George T. McGowan, from and after August 25, 1933, was, and still is, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-eighth Collection District at Buffalo, New York, and resides therein.

III

On or about August 12, 1926, the said Helen Hall Vail, pursuant to proceedings in the Supreme Court of the
1205 State of New York in and for the County of New York, a court of competent jurisdiction, was duly adjudged to be an incompetent person, incapable of managing herself and her affairs.

IV

On or about August 25, 1926, the plaintiff, then known as The Farmers Loan and Trust Company, was duly appointed Committee of the property and estate of said Helen Hall Vail, and thereupon duly qualified and continued to act as such Committee until the death of said Helen Hall Vail.

1206

V

Following plaintiff's appointment as Committee of the property and estate of said Helen Hall Vail, her daughter, MaBelle Houghton Plumb, on October 8, 1926, petitioned the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, for fixation of allowances to herself and others out of the surplus income of the incompetent.

By order of the court, entered January 14, 1927, the plaintiff, as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, was directed to pay out of the incompetent's surplus income each year in quarterly payments the following sums to the following named persons:

1207

To MaBelle Houghton Plumb, daughter of said incompetent person, the sum of Fifty Thousand ($50,000.) Dollars.

To Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, minor grandchildren of said incompetent person, the sum of Fifty Thousand ($50,000.) Dollars.

To Edward Hegeman Hall, a brother of said incompetent person, the sum of Two Thousand ($2,000.) Dollars.

1208

To Mary Hall Taft, a sister of said incompetent person, the sum of Three Thousand ($3,000.) Dollars.

To Elizabeth Hall Burdick, a sister of said incompetent person, the sum of Two Thousand ($2,000.) Dollars.

To Abbe Ferrin, a sister of said incompetent person, the sum of Two Thousand ($2,000.) Dollars.

To Lucy Hall Ferris, a sister of said incompetent person, the sum of Two Thousand ($2,000.) Dollars.

1209

In its order of January 14, 1927, the Supreme Court found that the incompetent would have made such allowance if she had been in the possession of her mental faculties.

VI

MaBelle Houghton Plumb on April 26, 1932, petitioned the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, for an order directing the City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail (incompetent) to pay her out of its unexpended

1210 *Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.*

surplus income in the possession of the Committee $250,000 and $250,000 to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, minor grandchildren of said incompetent. This petition was amended on or about May 25, 1932, the petitioner praying that the Court allow an additional allowance of Twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000.) a year to her and an additional Twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000.) a year to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris,
1211 infants, and further that said allowance be made retroactive to cover the years 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930 and 1931, so that there would be paid to the petitioner a back or retroactive allowance of One hundred twenty-five thousand dollars ($125,000.) and that to be paid to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, infants, a back or retroactive allowance of One Hundred twenty-five thousand dollars ($125,000.). The amended petition was allowed by order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, entered June 3, 1932, which provided that plaintiff as Committee of the incompetent was to pay
1212 out of the income of said incompetent person received by it in each quarter in addition to the amounts paid by said Committee under said order dated January 14, 1927, to MaBell Houghton Plumb the sum of $6,250 and to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian as aforesaid, the sum of $6,250.

VII

The Court's order of June 3, 1932, by its terms, was made retroactive and directed the said Committee to pay out of the accumulated surplus income of the incompetent person, then in its possession, to MaBelle Houghton

1213

Plumb and Ieuan Harris as General Guardian, as aforesaid, the sum of $131,250, each, as and for a payment of $25,000 per annum for the five calendar years prior to the entry of such order and for the payment of $6,250 to each as and for the quarterly installment due March 31, 1932, of the additional allowances granted by said order of June 3, 1932.

VIII

1214

Pursuant to the two orders of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, dated January 14, 1927, and June 3, 1932, respectively, and from the date of the first order to December 27, 1935, the date of the death of the incompetent, Helen Hall Vail, plaintiff, as Committee of the property of said Helen Hall Vail, paid, out of the surplus income of the incompetent, to the persons named in said orders allowances aggregating the sum of $1,377,866.67.

IX

1215

Plaintiff, as the Committee of the property and estate of the incompetent, on or about May 9, 1933, filed with the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, an account of its proceedings for the period from August 12, 1926, to July 1, 1933, which embraced and reflected all payments made during said period by said Committee pursuant to the orders entered by the Supreme Court of the State of New York, on January 14, 1927, and June 3, 1932, respectively.

Thereafter an order was made and entered by the court which approved, ratified and confirmed all of the payments made by said Committee for the period from August 12, 1926, to July 1, 1933.

1216 *Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.*

X

After the death of Helen Hall Vail plaintiff rendered its final account as Committee to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, embracing and reflecting all payments made by it for the period from July 1, 1933, to the date of the death of the incompetent, December 27, 1935, which was thereafter confirmed, ratified and approved by a final order of said Supreme Court.

1217

XI

On or about January 27, 1937, plaintiff, as administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, filed with the defendant, pursuant to the Revenue Act of 1926 and the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended, an estate tax return. In Schedule E of said return plaintiff, as such administrator, set forth for information purposes the aggregate amount of the allowances paid pursuant to said orders of January 14, 1927, and June 3, 1932, to-wit, the sum of $1,377,866.67; but plaintiff did not include said amount in computing the
1218 estate tax payable by it as such administrator.

XII

Thereafter the Commissioner of Internal Revenue audited and reviewed plaintiff's estate tax return and thereupon on April 5, 1938, determined a deficiency in decedent's federal estate tax liability in the sum of $645,654.48, of which the sum of $436,031.67 was attributable to the inclusion in the decedent's gross estate of said sum of $1,377,866.67, under the provisions of Section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended.

1219

XIII

Of said deficiency of $645,654.48 assessed by the Commissioner, the sum of $436,031.67, together with interest thereon in the sum of $30,880.60, or a total of $466,912.27 was paid by the plaintiff on June 22, 1938.

XIV

Thereafter, on or about July 9, 1938, plaintiff, as such administrator, filed with the defendant its claim for refund of said sum of $436,031.67, together with interest thereon in the sum of $30,880.60, or for the sum of $466,912.27, which claim for refund was thereafter, on or about July 29, 1938, wholly rejected and denied in writing by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on the ground that the said transfers were made in contemplation of death and that the property so transferred had been properly included in decedent's gross estate under the provisions of Section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended.

1220

XV

Helen Hall Vail was twice married. Her first husband was Charles F. Houghton, by whom she had three children: Florence, who died in infancy, Laura and MaBelle. Laura Houghton married Ieuan Harris, and had three children, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris. Laura Houghton Harris died on or about August 31, 1925, being survived by her husband and three children. The father, Ieuan Harris, was appointed General Guardian of the three children by the Surrogates Court of the County of Ontario, State of New York, and was so acting during the times herein mentioned.

1221

1222 *Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.*

MaBelle Houghton married Joseph H. Plumb, and is now known as MaBelle Houghton Plumb, and has one son, Joseph H. Plumb, Jr.

When adjudicated incompetent Mrs. Vail was 71 years of age and was suffering from an incurable ailment.

XVI

Allowances by Mrs. Vail, prior to her being declared incompetent, to her daughters have never exceeded $6,000 per year to each. In 1912 she gave each $1,500; in 1913,
1223 $3,000; and since 1914 $6,000 annually. In addition, at one time she did give Mrs. Plumb $5,000, and to each of her two daughters a residence of considerable value.

Mrs. Vail never made any allowances to the issue of her daughter, Laura Houghton Harris, either prior or subsequent to the death of the said Laura Houghton Harris on August 31, 1925.

XVII

The amounts of the estate of Mrs. Vail in 1912 was large. It had been accumulated from 1897 when her first husband died.

1224

XVIII

For the five years preceding the adjudication that Mrs. Helen Hall Vail was incompetent, the average annual income from the trust was $318,000.

XIX

Subsequent to her adjudication, the incompetent's income increased on the average annually not to exceed 25 per cent over the average of the preceding five years. By the order of January 14, 1927, the allowances to the daughter, MaBell Houghton Plumb, was jumped from

1225

$6,000 to $50,000 per year or 800 per cent, and the allowance to the issue of Laura Houghton Harris was jumped from 0 to $50,000.

XX

No allowances were ever made by Mrs. Vail to collateral heirs, except to Mrs. Ferris to whom an allowance of $500 annually was paid.

XXI

Neither the petition of 1926 nor that of 1932 show, 1226
nor was any proof offered in support thereof to show the need of any allowance to any of the direct or collateral heirs. The petition of 1932 shows no need of any allowance to any of the direct heirs and does not mention the collateral heirs.

XXII

The Referee in the 1926 proceeding recommended an allowance of $50,000 to the General Guardian of the Harris children to be applied by him to their "maintenance and support." During this period the father of these children had an annual gross income of $200,000. 1227

XXIII

The records of the proceedings in 1926 and 1932, specifies the intent and parpose to equalize allowances to direct heirs so that each would share equally in the estate of the incompetent upon her death.

XXIV

The increase in the allowance in 1932 was a gift made in anticipation of succession to the estate by MaBell

1228 *Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.*

Houghton Plumb and the children of Laura Houghton Harris the only direct heirs of the incompetent.

XXV

The making of the retroactive allowances aggregating $250,000 was a means of distributing part of the incompetent's estate in anticipation of her death.

XXVI

A substantial part of this estate was withdrawn by
1229 these allowances. The amount, as heretofore stated, was $1,377,866.67.

XXVII

In the proceedings by which the allowances were made to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and others by the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, Mrs. Plumb stipulated that the ultimate amount she should receive from the estate of the incompetent on the death of the incompetent should not exceed that to be paid the General Guardian on account of the Harris children; and these allowances were characterized in the
1230 stipulations as "advancements."

XXVIII

All sums of money paid to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, minor grandchildren of the incompetent, Helen Hall Vail, and to Edward Hegeman Hall, Mary Hall Taft, Elizabeth Hall Burdick, Abbe Ferrin and Lucy Hall Ferris, by the Committee of the property of Helen Hall Vail, pursuant to the order entered by Honorable Richard P. Lydon, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, on

January 14, 1927, and pursuant to the order entered by Hon. Phoenix Ingraham, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, on June 3, 1932, were motivated by the same considerations that lead to, and were intended as, testamentary dispositions of the property and the estate of the incompetent and were transfers made in contemplation of death and in anticipation of the succession to the estate of said incompetent, save and except the sum of $6,000 paid annually to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, minor grandchildren of the incompetent, and except the sum of $500 paid annually to Lucy Hall Ferris.

Conclusions of Law

I

The gifts made by the incompetent, acting through the Supreme Court of the State of New York, in excess of $6,000 annually to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, minor grandchildren of the incompetent, and in excess of $500 annually made to her sister, Lucy Hall Ferris, were made in contemplation of death within the meaning of Section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended by Section 803(a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, now Section 811(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

II

Plaintiff has not established by a fair preponderance of the evidence that the gifts made by the incompetent acting through the Supreme Court of New York in excess of $6,000 annually to MaBelle Houghton Plumb and

1234 *Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.*

Ieuan Harris, General Guardian of John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris, minor grandchildren of the incompetent, and in excess of $500 annually made to her sister, Lucy Hall Ferris, were not made in contemplation of death within the meaning of Section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended by Section 803(a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, now Section 811(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

III

1235

Defendant, upon the facts and the evidence, is entitled to judgment dismissing plaintiff's complaint except that the parties have stipulated and agreed that the plaintiff is now entitled to judgment under the decision of this Court after credit for payment of additional State Inheritance Taxes to the States of New York and Florida, respectively, in the sum of $54,100.24, with interest thereon at the rate of 6 per cent (6%) per annum from the twenty-second of June, 1938.

IV

1236

That the plaintiff have and recover from the defendant costs in this action.

That Judgment Be Entered Accordingly.

John Knight
United States District Judge.

Stipulation as to Amount of Judgment.

1237

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the attorneys for the respective parties to the above entitled action that the estate tax liability of the plaintiff, as Administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, was computed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, after giving effect to the decision of this Court filed herein on February 25, 1942, and after giving the estate credits for gift tax paid, in the sum of $52,276.15, and State inheritance taxes paid, aggregating $158,368.82, against total assessments, with interest, made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue against the estate, aggregating $1,008,922.38, and an overpayment was determined by the Commissioner in the sum of $54,100.24, and

1238

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED that the aforesaid overpayment, as set forth in the Schedule hereto annexed and made a part hereof, was made by the plaintiff to the defendant on June 22, 1938, and that this stipulation and the said Schedule, so annexed and made a part hereof, shall be incorporated in and made a part of the record in this case, and

1239

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED that the judgment to be entered by the Court in this action shall provide that plaintiff recover of the defendant the sum of $54,100.24, with interest thereon at the rate of 6% per

1240

annum from June 22, 1938, together with the lawfully taxed costs of this action.

Dated: Buffalo, New York, May 14, 1943.

MONTGOMERY, GRACE & DERBY,
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

GEORGE L. GROBE,
GEORGE L. GROBE,
United States Attorney in and for
1241 the Western District of New York,
Attorney for Defendant.

SCHEDULE

MT-ET-4169-28th New York
Estate of Helen Hail Vail
Date of death—December 27, 1935

RECOMPUTATION OF ESTATE TAX LIABILITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MEMORANDUM OF THE CHIEF COUNSEL, DATED NOVEMBER 12, 1942

1242

Net estate previously determined (1926 Act)		$3,196,070
Net estate previously determined (1932 Act)		3,256,070
Less:		
Payments allowed as distribution in accordance with the decision of the District Court for the Western District of New York (9 years at $12,500.00)	$112,500.00	
Net estate as adjusted (1926 Act)		$3,083,570
Net estate as adjusted (1932 Act)		3,143,570

Stipulation as to Amount of Judgment.

Amount assessed on return..	419,616.73			
Assessed pursuant to waiver	436,031.67			
Interest	30,880.60			
Assessed by Bureau.....	104,674.68			
Interest	17,718.70			
Total Assessments		$1,008,922.38		
Assessed but not paid.....		122,393.38		
Assessed and paid.....			886,529.00	
Gross basic tax (1926 Act)..	248,528.51			
Credit for gift tax.....	43,663.05			
	204,865.46			
Credit for State estate, inheritance, legacy or succession taxes	158,368.82			
Net tax (1926 Act).....		46,496.64		
Total gross tax (1926 and 1932 Acts) $1,015,771.21				
Gross tax (1926 Act).....	248,528.51			
Gross additional tax (1932 Act)	767,242.70			
Credit for gift tax.....	8,613.10			
Net additional tax.....		758,629.60		
Net tax due (adjusted).....		805,126.24		
Interest		27,302.52		
Correct net tax due.....			832,428.76	
Overpayment			$ 54,100.24	

1246

Judgment.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

This action having been duly brought to trial before the Honorable John Knight, United States District Judge, at a Term of this Court, held in the Court House thereof,
1247 Niagara Square, Buffalo, New York, on the 6th day of May, 1941, and the cause having been presented to the Court without the intervention of a jury, and the trial having been continued to May 7, 1941, by order of the Court, and the Court, on May 14, 1943, having made and entered its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and the parties hereto having entered into a stipulation made May 14, 1943, hereto annexed and specifically made a part hereof, that the plaintiff is entitled to judgment under the decision of this Court after credit for payment of additional State inheritance taxes to the States of New York and Florida, respectively, in the sum of
1248 $54,100.24, together with interest thereon from the 22nd day of June, 1938, at the rate of 6% per annum, plus costs and disbursements, and the costs of the plaintiff having been taxed herein at $301.03,

NOW, THEREFORE, it is

ADJUDGED that the plaintiff, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, recover of the defendant, George T. McGowan, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-eighth Collection Dis-

1249

trict of New York, the sum of $54,190.24, together with interest thereon from June 22, 1938, at the rate of 6% per annum, and the sum of $301.03, costs and disbursements as taxed as aforesaid.

Dated: May 14, 1943.

Enter,

JOHN KNIGHT,
U. S. D. J.

1250

MAY C. SICKMON,
Clerk of the United States District Court,
for the Western District of New York.

1251

1252 **Certificate of Probable Cause.**

IN THE
DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

[SAME TITLE]

The issues in this action having been duly brought to trial before the Hon. John Knight, United States District Judge, at a Term of this Court, held in the Court House thereof, Niagara Square, Buffalo, New York, on
1253 the 6th day of May, 1941, and the parties having waived a trial by jury by not making demand therefor and thereby consenting to the trial and determination of the cause by the Court without a jury, and the trial having been continued to May 7, 1941, by order of the Court, and all the parties having appeared and the Court having heard the allegations, proofs, and arguments of the respective parties, and due deliberation having been had and judgment against the defendant having been entered herein on May 14th, 1943, in the amount of $54,100.24, with interest thereon from June 22, 1938, as required by law, together with costs in the sum of $301.03.

1254 NOW, THEREFORE, pursuant to Revised Statutes, Section 989 (Title 28, U. S. C. Section 842), I hereby certify that there was probable cause for the acts done by the defendant as Collector of Internal Revenue that resulted in a judgment against him.

Dated: Buffalo, New York, May 14th, 1943.

JOHN KNIGHT,
U. S. D. J.

CONSENT is hereby given to the entry of the foregoing.

MONTGOMERY, GRACE & DERBY,
Attorneys for the Plaintiff.

Notice of Appeal.

1255

IN THE

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

[SAME TITLE]

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that City Bank Farmers Trust Company, formerly known as The Farmers Loan and 1256
Trust Company, as Administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, the plaintiff above named, hereby appeals to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from the final judgment made and entered by the above entitled Court in the above entitled cause on the 14th day of May, 1943, in so far as the recovery awarded to the plaintiff is less than the sum demanded in the complaint.

Dated: August 9th, 1943.

MONTGOMERY, GRACE & DERBY,

1257

By JAMES LLOYD DERBY,

J. SEYMOUR MONTGOMERY, JR.,

Members of the firm

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased,

Office and P. O. Address:

One Cedar Street,

Borough of Manhattan,

City of New York, N. Y.

1258 *Notice of Appeal.*

PARTIES TO THE JUDGMENT APPEALED FROM:

Party

City Bank Farmers Trust Company, formerly known as The Farmers Loan and Trust Company, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased, Plaintiff-Appellant,

George T. McGowan, Collector of Internal
1259 Revenue for the Twenty-eighth Collection District, New York, Defendant-Appellee.

Name and Address of Attorney

MONTGOMERY, GRACE & DERBY,
One Cedar Street,
New York 5, N. Y.

GEORGE L. GROBE,
United States Attorney
in and for the Western
1260 District of New York,
United States Court House,
Buffalo, New York.

Plaintiff-Appellant's Designation of the Portions of the Record, Proceedings and Evidence to be Contained in the Record on Appeal. 1261

IN THE

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

[SAME TITLE]

1262

Comes now the Plaintiff-Appellant in the above entitled case and designates the following portions of the record, proceedings and evidence to be included in the Record on Appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit:

I. The complaint.

II. Defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint, entered August 7, 1939.

III. Order of January 2, 1940, denying motion to dismiss complaint.

IV. Opinion thereon of Judge John Knight, dated December 21, 1939. 1263

V. The answer.

VI. Plaintiff's notice of April 24, 1941, to admit facts.

VII. Affidavit of Assistant U. S. Attorney Robert M. Hitchcock of April 28, 1941, pursuant to Rule 36 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

VIII. Transcript of the proceedings, excluding the matter which follows line 4 of page 32 through page 132 of said transcript.

1264 *Plaintiff-Appellant's Designation of the Portions of the Record, Proceedings and Evidence to be Contained in the Record on Appeal.*

IX. Plaintiff's exhibits, as follows:

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 1—Appraiser's report, taxing order, receipt for tax, New York State Transfer Tax Return.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 2—Certificate of no appeal.

1265 Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 3—Certified copy of Letters of Administration.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 5—Inquisition.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 6—Order of New York Supreme Court of August 12, 1926, appointing Committees.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 7—Commission to Committees, dated August 25, 1926.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 9—Petition of MaBelle H. Plumb, verified October 8, 1926.

1266 Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 10—Answer and cross-petition of the Farmers Loan and Trust Company, Committee of the Property, dated November 19, 1926.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 14—Testimony before Referee Philip J. Dunn.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 15—Report of Referee.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 16—Order of New York Supreme Court of January 14, 1927, granting allowances. (NOTE: This order is annexed to the Complaint as Exhibit "A".)

Plaintiff-Appellant's Designation of the Portions of the Record, Proceedings and Evidence to be Contained in the Record on Appeal. 1267

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 17—Petition of MaBelle H. Plumb, verified April 26, 1932.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 19—Answer of City Bank Farmers Trust Company, Committee of the Property, verified May 2, 1932.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 21—Answer of Ieuan Harris as General Guardian, verified May 5, 1932. 1268

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 23—Order of New York Supreme Court of May 4, 1932, appointing Special Guardian and Referee.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 26—Testimony before Referee Townsend Morgan.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 28—Report of Referee.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 29—Order of New York Supreme Court of May 31, 1932, amending title and prayer of petition.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 30—Order of New York Supreme Court of June 3, 1932, granting allowances. (NOTE: This Exhibit is annexed to the Complaint as Exhibit "B".) 1269

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 31—Report of Special Guardian Cornelius J. Smyth.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 32—Intermediate account of Committee of the Property. (NOTE: Only pp. 1 to 6, inclusive, being the preamble, and all of Schedule F-3, showing allowances paid, to be included.)

1270 *Plaintiff-Appellant's Designation of the Portions of the Record, Proceedings and Evidence to be Contained in the Record on Appeal.*

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 33—Supplemental intermediate account of Committee of the Property. (NOTE: Only pp. 1 to 3, inclusive, being the preamble, and all of Schedule F-3, showing allowances paid, to be included.)

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 35—Judgment of New York Supreme Court of February 20, 1934,
1271 settling intermediate account.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 36—Final account of Committee of the Property. (NOTE: Only pp. 1 to 7, being the preamble, and all of Schedule G, showing allowances paid, to be included.)

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 37—Final order of New York Supreme Court of December 9, 1936, settling final account.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 38—Federal estate tax
1272 return.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 39—Claim for refund.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 40—Letter from Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated November 3, 1937.

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 41—Letter from Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated April 5, 1938. (NOTE: This exhibit is annexed to the complaint, marked "Exhibit D".)

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 43—Letter of Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated July 28, 1938, rejecting claim for refund.

Plaintiff-Appellant's Designation of the Portions of the Record, Proceedings and Evidence to be Contained in the Record on Appeal. 1273

X. Opinion of the Court.

XI. Findings of fact and conclusions of law.

XII. Stipulation of May 14, 1943, as to amount of judgment.

XIII. The judgment.

XIV. Certificate of probable cause.

XV. Notice of appeal. 1274

XVI. Plaintiff-Appellant's designation of the portions of the record, proceedings, and evidence to be contained in the Record on Appeal.

XVII. Statement of points relied upon by Plaintiff-Appellant.

Dated: August 9th, 1943.

MONTGOMERY, GRACE & DERBY,
By JAMES LLOYD DERBY,
J. SEYMOUR MONTGOMERY, JR.,
Members of the firm 1275
Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased,
Office & P. O. Address:
One Cedar Street,
Borough of Manhattan,
City of New York, N. Y.

1276 *Plaintiff-Appellant's Designation of the Portions of the Record, Proceedings and Evidence to be Contained in the Record on Appeal.*

To:

GEORGE L. GROBE, ESQ.,
United States Attorney in and for the
Western District of New York,
Attorney for Defendant-Appellee,
502 United States Court House,
Buffalo, New York.

1277 MAY C. SICKMON,
Clerk of the United States District Court
for the Western District of New York.

1278

Stipulation Amending Designation of Record. 1279

IN THE

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Civil 131

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, formerly known as The Farmers Loan and Trust Company, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of HELEN HALL VAIL, deceased, 1280

Plaintiff,

against

GEORGE T. McGOWAN, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-eighth Collection District, New York,

Defendant.

The Plaintiff-Appellant herein, pursuant to Rule 75(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, having duly 1281 served upon the Defendant-Appellee its Designation of the portions of the record, proceedings and evidence to be contained in the Record on Appeal herein, and the Defendant-Appellee not having within the time required by said rule filed or served a designation of additional portions of the record, proceedings and evidence to be included in said Record on Appeal, and the said Plaintiff-Appellant having inadvertently failed in designating the portions of said record, proceedings and evidence to eliminate certain irrelevant material constituting part of Plaintiff's Exhibits 1 and 38,

1282 *Stipulation Amending Designation of Record.*

Now, in order to comply with Rule 75(e) of said Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which requires the omission of all irrelevant and formal portions of documents,

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the attorneys for the Plaintiff-Appellant and the attorneys for the Defendant-Appellee that the Plaintiff-Appellant's said Designation of the portions of the record, proceedings and evidence to be contained in the Record on Appeal herein dated August 9, 1943, be and the same hereby is amended
1283 to the following extent.

Item IX thereof shall be and is hereby amended to read as follows:

"IX. Plaintiff's Exhibits, as follows:

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 1—(1) Total amounts of Schedules A, B and C of the New York estate tax return (2) Schedule E of New York estate tax return; (3)

'RECAPITULATION' from report of New York estate tax appraiser dated June 27, 1936; (4)
1284 Order of Surrogate's Court, Ontario County, New York, determining decedent's gross and net estates and fixing tax.

* * * * * *

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 38—(1) Schedule E of Federal estate tax return (omitting printed instructions); (2) Schedule L of Federal estate tax returns; (3) Schedule M of Federal estate tax return; (4) Schedule N of Federal estate tax return; (5) 'Computation of Tax' of Federal estate tax return; (6) 'General Information' of Federal estate tax return."

Stipulation Amending Designation of Record. 1285

AND IT IS HEREBY FURTHER STIPULATED that except as hereinabove expressly amended, the Plaintiff-Appellant's said Designation of the portions of the record, proceedings and evidence to be contained in the Record on Appeal herein shall remain in full force and effect.

AND IT IS HEREBY FURTHER STIPULATED that the said Record on Appeal herein shall consist of the record, proceedings and evidence designated in the Plaintiff-Appellant's said Designation of the portions of the record, proceedings and evidence to be contained in the Record on Appeal herein as hereby amended. 1286

Dated: September 30, 1943.

MONTGOMERY, GRACE & DERBY,
Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant.

SAMUEL O. CLARK, JR.,
Attorneys for Defendant-Appellee.

1287

1288 **Statement of Points.**

IN THE

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

Comes now the plaintiff-appellant in the above entitled case and files the following Statement of Points, relied
1289 upon by the plaintiff-appellant for reversal of the judgment entered in said case by the United States District Court for the Western District of New York on the 14th day of May, 1943:

(1) The Court erred in holding that the payments of the allowances granted by the order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, dated January 14, 1927, were transfers in contemplation of death within the purview of Section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, and as such subject to the estate tax imposed by the said Act.

1290

(2) The Court erred in holding that the payments of the allowances granted by the order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, dated June 3, 1932, were transfers in contemplation of death within the purview of Section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, and as such subject to the estate tax imposed by said Act.

(3) The Court erred in ascribing a testamentary motive or purpose within the meaning of Section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, to the order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York dated January

14, 1927, granting allowances out of the surplus income of the incompetent to her daughter, MaBelle H. Plumb, and to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of her grandsons, John H. Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris to the extent that the said order directed payments to them in excess of $6,000 per annum.

(4) The Court erred in ascribing a testamentary motive or purpose within the meaning of Section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, to the order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York dated June 3, 1292
1932 granting allowances out of the surplus income of the incompetent to her daughter, MaBelle H. Plumb, and to Ieuan Harris as General Guardian of her grandsons, John H Harris, William R. Harris and David F. Harris to the extent that the said order directed payments to them in excess of $6,000 per annum.

(5) The Court erred in holding that a testamentary motive within the meaning of Section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926 and its amendments is to be imputed to court orders directing payments out of the surplus income of the incompetent to her next of kin for the reason 1293
that such payments anticipated intestate succession.

(6) The Court erred in holding that a testamentary motive within the meaning of Section 302 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, and its amendments, is to be imputed to court orders directing payments out of the surplus income of the incompetent to her collateral relatives for the reason that such payments anticipated intestate succession, even though such collaterals were not entitled to take by intestacy.

(7) The Court erred in holding that the evidence and the records of proceedings in the Supreme Court of the

1294 *Statement of Points.*

State of New York support the determination of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that the allowances paid pursuant to the orders of January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932 to next of kin of the incompetent were testamentary in character, in that there was no evidence in the records, and the Court made no finding, that such allowances were designed or intended to evade inheritance taxes.

(8) The Court erred in holding that the evidence and the records of proceedings in the Supreme Court of the
1295 State of New York support the determination of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that the allowances paid pursuant to the orders of January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932 to certain persons other than the next of kin of the incompetent were testamentary in character, in that there was no evidence in the records, and the Court made no finding, that such allowances were designed or intended to evade inheritance taxes.

(9) The Court erred in holding that the allowances were transferred in contemplation of death since, inasmuch as they were directed to be paid out of surplus, spendable income, and only for so long as the incom-
1296 petent continued to live, the transfers were not in the nature of substitutes for testamentary dispositions such as Congress intended to reach and tax by Section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended.

(10) The Court erred in holding that although the New York Supreme Court was without jurisdiction to make a testamentary disposition of the property of an incompetent person, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was not foreclosed from attributing to the orders of January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932 granting allowances, a testamentary motive within the meaning of Section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended.

Statement of Points. 1297

(11) The Court erred in rejecting evidence of the judgments of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, dated February 20, 1934 and December 9, 1936, by which the accounts of the City Bank Farmers Trust Company which embraced payments of the allowances directed by orders of said Court dated January 14, 1927 and June 3, 1932 were approved and settled.

Dated, August 9th, 1943.

1298

MONTGOMERY, GRACE & DERBY,
By JAMES LLOYD DERBY,
J. SEYMOUR MONTGOMERY, JR.,
Members of the firm
Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant, City Bank Farmers Trust Company, as Administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Helen Hall Vail, deceased,
Office and P. O. Address,
One Cedar Street,
Borough of Manhattan,
City of New York, N. Y.

To: 1299

GEORGE L. GROBE, Esq.,
United States Attorney in and for the
Western District of New York,
Attorney for Defendant-Appellee,
502 United States Court House,
Buffalo, New York.

MAY C. SICKMON,
Clerk of the United States District Court
for the Western District of New York.

1300

Stipulation as to Record.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, that the foregoing printed record contains a full, true and correct record of the said District Court in the above entitled action necessary for the determination of the appeal herein, as agreed on by the parties, and that the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of New York may certify the same without further comparison as and for a complete and true transcript of the Record on the Appeal in said case.

1301

Dated, ~~October 21~~ November 6, 1943.

MONTGOMERY, GRACE & DERBY,
Attorneys for Plaintiff

1302

SAMUEL O. CLARK, JR.,
Attorney for Defendant.

Clerk's Certificate. 1303

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

[SAME TITLE]

I, MAY C. SICKMON, Clerk of the District Court of the United States of America, for the Western District of New York, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of the said district Court in 1304 the above entitled action, as agreed upon by the parties.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have caused the seal of the said District Court to be hereunto affixed at the City of Buffalo, in the Western District of New York, this 9th day of November in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and forty-three, and of the Independence of the United States, the one hundred and sixty-ninth. (Seal)

May C. Sickmon

Clerk. 1305

Time for filing record extended to November 20, 1943 by order of Clerk of C.C.A. Dated Nov. 1, 1943 & filed in District Court Nov. 3, 1943

May C. Sickmon
Clerk U.S.D.C.

Press of Fremont Payne, Inc.
(28370)

[fol. 436] UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 228

October Term, 1943.

(Argued March 30, 1944 Decided May 10, 1944.)

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, as Administrator, Appellant,

v.

GEORGE T. McGOWAN, Collector, Appellee

BEFORE: L. HAND, SWAN and CHASE, *Circuit Judges*

Appeal by the plaintiff, as administrator, from so much of a judgment of the District Court for the Western District of New York, as denied a part of its claim to recover the amount paid by it as the estate tax of its intestate.

J. Seymour Montgomery, Jr., for the appellant.
Carlton Fox, for the appellee.

[fol. 437] L. HAND, *Circuit Judge*:

The plaintiff is the administrator of Helen Hall Vail, a deceased incompetent; it sued to recover the amount which it had paid to the defendant, as collector, as an estate tax levied on her estate. The judgment allowed part of the claim and denied the rest; and the plaintiff appeals from the denial. The facts were as follows. Helen Hall Vail, the intestate, was declared incompetent by the Supreme Court of New York, where she lived, in August, 1926; and the plaintiff was appointed a committee of her property. She was then a widow, over seventy years old and incurably insane. Her next of kin were a daughter and three infant children of a dead daughter who lived with their father. She owned real estate in Geneva, New York, Palm Beach, Florida, and New Jersey; and including accumulations of past income, she had personal property, of about $1,000,000. Besides, she was the life beneficiary of a trust in her favor created by her first husband, the income from which was about $300,000 a year; and her income from all sources in-

cluding this was about $350,000. On October 8, 1926, her daughter petitioned the New York court to direct the plaintiff, as committee, to pay annually to certain named persons reasonable allowances out of the incompetent's surplus income, and the court referred the petition to a referee to hear testimony. The referee found that the utmost amount necessary for the incompetent's support, including the payment of taxes, would "fall far short of the sum of $50,000 per annum" and that there would remain "a balance of income of over $250,000," and recommended certain allowances. The court confirmed the report and directed the plaintiff to pay to the daughter annually $50,000, and to the guardian of the grand-children the same amount. It also directed the plaintiff to pay $2,000 a year to a brother, $2,000 to each of three sisters, and $3,000 to a [fol. 438] fourth sister. On April 26, 1932, the daughter petitioned the court for an increased allowance; and this petition was referred to another referee. He heard testimony and recommended that the allowances to the daughter and to the grand-children be increased by $25,000, and these increases should be paid retroactively. The court confirmed his report and entered an order to that effect. Under both these orders the plaintiff, as committee, paid out of surplus income the specified amounts until the death of the incompetent on December 27, 1935. The aggregate of these payments the commissioner included in the incompetent's estate on the ground that they were made in contemplation of death under §302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926. The district judge held that all the payments were part of the incompetent's estate except $6,000 of the annual payments to the daughter, $6,000 of those to the grandchildren, and $500 of those to one of the sisters. His reasons for making these exception were that the gifts pro tanto "were motivated by the same motive which would have led the incompetent, Helen Hall Vail, to make payments in these amounts to these respective parties." Between the year 1914 and August 1926, when the incompetent was adjudged incompetent, she had given $6,000 annually to her two daughters, and $500 annually to the sister in question.

Section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926 covers "any interest * * * of which the decedent has at any time made a transfer * * * in contemplation of * * * death." The payments at bar were not made by the dece-

dent, so that literally, the words do not apply. Nevertheless, the property was transferred, for the law gave the judges power to transfer it. The first question therefore is whether we should hold that the section covers such payments in case they are made "in contemplation of death," a question which we may reserve for the moment. We are satisfied that the proper construction of the section is as though it read: "any interest * * * of which at any [fol. 439] time a transfer has been made from the decedent in contemplation of death." We have no doubt that if Congress had been faced with a situation like that before us, it would have included payments made by the court out of the property of an incompetent; to hold otherwise would be to frustrate the plain purpose of the section. Moreover, that once granted, the intent of the court must control in deciding whether the payments were made "in contemplation of death," for obviously the incompetent herself could have no intent of any kind. The judges' intent was to make such gifts as the incompetent would have made, if she had been competent, so the orders said; but that cannot have meant such gifts as she would have made, had she been not only competent, but expecting to continue competent until she died. It must have meant such gifts as she would have made, if for the moment lucid, but with the prospect of imminent incompetency before her. There can be no doubt as to this, for the judges had no evidence whatever from her past conduct for supposing that, if she had looked forward to ending her life in full possession of her faculties, she would have given away every year to her daughter, her grandchildren and her brother and sisters, more than $160,000 out of the $250,000 which remained to her after paying her taxes and expenses. The allowances she had theretofore made did not remotely approach such figures.

Little has been added by the Supreme Court to what was said as to the phrase, "in contemplation of death," in *United States* v. *Wells*, 283 U. S. 102, which remains our authoritative guide. The only other decisions of that court which can be said to throw any light upon it are *Becker* v. *St. Louis Union Trust Co.*, 296 U. S. 48, overruled on another point in *Helvering* v. *Hallock*, 309 U. S. 106; and *Colorado National Bank* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* 305 U. S. 23 and neither of these professes to modify the doctrine as there laid down. Its outlines were indeed

[fol. 440] not sharp, or intended to be sharp, but some things are clear. Such a gift need not be in contemplation of imminent death; the section applies to gifts made by the young and healthy, as well as by the old and infirm. It covers "substitutes for testamentary dispositions." If they are such "substitutes," the test is the donor's motive, which "must be of the sort which leads to testamentary disposition" (p. 147). Moreover, even though they be "substitutes" and the motive be of that "sort," the donor must not be also actuated by a "dominant" motive of some other kind, which was left vague then, and has not yet been defined. Among such motives apparently is the desire to accustom the donee to the management and responsibility of property, *United States* v. *Wells*, *supra*, 283 U. S. 102), the desire to make him independent, or to keep down the donor's surtaxes on his income (*Becker* v. *St. Louis Trust Co.*, *supra*, 296 U. S. 48, 52), the desire to escape the possible consequences of the donor's own speculations (*Colorado National Bank* v. *Commissioner*, *supra*, 305 U. S. 23, 26). Thus, if the gift be a "substitute" for a "testamentary disposition," and if the only motive be a desire to anticipate the benefit which the donee will eventually get by such a disposition, it might seem to follow inevitably that it is made "in contemplation of death." Yet, if that be true, every present gift, actuated by an undifferentiated desire to benefit the donee, is a gift "in contemplation of death," if only it is made to a person to whom the donor would have left the property on his death. In that event the gift tax covers only gifts which are not "substitutes for testamentary dispositions," and gifts, which, though they are such substitutes, are made with some "dominant" purpose of the specific character which takes a gift out of the section. Possibly that may be the law, but certainly it has not yet been clearly so declared.

We are not however confronted with that question here, because the gifts at bar were "substitutes for testamentary [fol. 441] dispositions" in a much more complete sense than the ordinary present gift inter vivos. First, they were made by one who could not enjoy the income during her life, but who must let it roll up and pass upon her intestacy. In *Farmers Loan & Trust Co.* v. *Bowers*, 68 Fed. (2) 916; 98 Fed. (2) 794 (C. C. A. 2)—"*The Astor Trusts Case*,"—for example, the donor had reserved to himself $150,000 annually out of the income of each trust which substantially

exhausted it, so that all that he really gave to his sons was in substance remainders after his death. That was as complete a substitute for a testamentary disposition as it was possible for a gift to be and still be a gift at all. We do not forget that the gift of a remainder is not one "intended to take effect in possession and enjoyment" at the donor's death. *May* v. *Heiner*, 281 U. S. 238. Nor do we mean that a gift to a person who would receive it upon the donor's death is inevitably a gift "in contemplation of death," whenever the donor reserves the income to himself for life. If the donor has a specific "dominant" motive of the required kind, such a gift will be excluded. But in determining whether a gift is one "in contemplation of death" an extremely weighty consideration is that by reserving the income to himself for life, the donor has so closely assimilated the gift to a testatmentary disposition. In *The Astor Trusts Case*, *supra*, that fact was, it is true, coupled with the donor's other, and perhaps "dominant," motive—to escape an estate tax—but that was not among those which the court will recognize.

Moreover, the facts in the case at bar are even stronger than if a sane person had reserved the income to himself and given away only a remainder to those who would in due course have received it anyway. Such a person has had power to dispose of the remainder before he makes the gift, a power of which the gift deprives him. But an incompetent has no such power, and any gift made on his be- [fol. 442] half deprives him of nothing; he is an inert conduit of the property to his next of kin, or to his legatees, if he has made a will while sane. It is true that in the case at bar the judges were authorized to act, and did act, for the incompetent, so that the incompetent is not to be deemed jurally impotent if this vicarious power can be imputed to her. But even if it can be, that power was very limited; as we ha[illegible] seen, it was confined to such gifts as she would have made, had she in a lucid interval contemplated her unhappy prospect. They had the choice of letting the surplus roll up, or of disposing of it as she would have disposed of it in such an interval, and as to the bulk of it they chose the daughter and grandchildren as donees, who were sure to take anyway. There could be no more complete "substitution" of a gift for a "testamentary"—in this case an intestate—"disposition" than that. Perhaps it still would not have been within the section, if the judges had made the allow-

ances in order to set up the donees in business, or something of the kind, but they did nothing of the sort. Indeed, upon the hearings before the referees the testamentary purpose was very frankly made plain, as the following excerpts from the remarks of counsel show. At the first hearing: "The granting of these allowances will only affect the persons who are applying for them, and they will eventually get the property upon Mrs. Vails' death." Again, "By granting these allowances the child and grandchildren will be simply getting now what they will eventually get in the end, with the exception of the small allowances asked for the brother and sisters of Mrs. Vail which they, the only persons interested in the estate are willing these sisters and brother should have." At the second hearing: "It is to me, not a matter of obtaining an allowance. It seems to be the idea of distributing part of this incompetent's property in anticipation more or less of her death." Again, "Where it is impossible for her to use it" (the income) "* * * [fol. 443] then the Court can make an advancement." And in accordance with this last suggestion the order provided that, so far as the payments to the daughter and the grandchildren might prove to be unequal, any excess given to one stirps should be regarded as an advancement in the distribution of the estate on intestacy, and should be charged against that stirps.

It is true that the allowances made to the brother and the sisters were not substitutes for that disposition of the property which would otherwise have taken place; on the contrary they diverted the money from those who would otherwise receive them. And yet it seems to us that it is enough to carry them along with the allowances to the daughter and grandchildren that the property transferred was beyond any power of the donor to enjoy, as were the remainders in *The Astor Trust Cases;* and that it was in addition beyond her individual power of disposition. Although they were not substitutes for the inevitable devolution of the property had they not been made, they were certainly testamentary in their character, and they were actuated by a motive of the sort that leads to testamentary dispositions. With less confidence as to these, we hold that they were also gifts "in contemplation of death" within 302(c).

Judgment affirmed.

SWAN, Circuit Judge (dissenting):

The question presented by this apeal is whether quarterly payments made by the committee of an incompetent, pursuant to orders of the New York Supreme Court, to relatives of the incompetent during nine years preceding her death, are to be considered property "of which the decedent has at any time made a transfer by trust or otherwise, in [fol. 444] contemplation of * * * death", within the meaning of section 302(c) of the Revenue Act of 1926, Int. Rev. Code §811(c).

The statutory language as interpreted by Treasury Regulations [1] and by the opinions of the Supreme Court, clearly shows that the operative fact which brings the section into play is "the state of mind" or "motive" of the donor at the time of the transfer. The power of a court of chancery having charge of an incompetent's property to direct allowances out of the incompetent's surplus income has long been recognized by English law and by the law of New York. *Ex parte Whitbread*, 2 Mer. 99, 35 Eng. Rep. 878; *Matter of Willoughby*, 11 Paige 257; *Matter of Flagler*, 248 N. Y. 415. Jurisdiction in this field is conferred upon the New York Supreme Court by §1356 of the Civil Practice Act. Section 1357 of that Act declares that the court exercising jurisdiction over the property of an incompetent "must preserve his property from waste or destruction; and, out of the proceeds thereof, must provide for * * * the safe keeping and maintenance, and the education, when required, of the incompetent person and his family." As stated in *Matter of Flagler, supra*, at page 419, allowances out of the incompetent's surplus income are granted "upon the theory that the lunatic would, in all probability, have made such

[1] Art. 16, Treas. Reg. 80, says in part:

> "A transfer in contemplation of death is a disposition of property prompted by the thought of death. * * *
>
> As the phrase 'transfer in contemplation of death' is applicable to many varying transactions, the circumstances of each case must be examined to ascertain the motive which induced the decedent to make the transfer. If the transfer results from mixed motives, one of which is the thought of death, the more compelling motive controls. * * *"

payments if he had been of sound mind." In the case at bar the orders of the New York Supreme Court embodied findings that if the incompetent were in possession of her [fol. 445] mental faculties she would have made the allowances ordered by the court. It is against this background that the problem must be considered.

My brothers recognize that "obviously the incompetent herself could have had no intent of any kind" with respect to the allowances ordered by the state court. They then ascribe to her "the intent of the court"; not however, the intent expressed in the court's finding that she would have made the gifts, if competent, but an intent to make "such gifts as she would have made, if for the moment lucid, but with the prospect of imminent incompetency before her." This seems to me the veriest fiction. Fictions, of course, have frequently been employed in legal reasoning, but not so far as I am aware, to extend the coverage of a taxing act beyond its letter. In the words of Mr. Justice Sutherland in *Crooks* v. *Harrelson*, 282 U. S. 55, at 61, "the fact must not be overlooked that we are here concerned with a taxing act, with regard to which the general rule requiring adherence to the letter applies with peculiar strictness." It is true that the sums paid out pursuant to the state court orders decreased the amount of the incompetent's estate at death, and in so far as they were paid to her next of kin may perhaps be characterized as the "substitution" of a gift inter vivos for an "intestate disposition." But, as my brothers recognize, gifts to next of kin are not necessarily transfers in contemplation of death—it turns on the donor's dominant motive. *United States* v. *Wells*, 283 U. S. 102, 117. The allowances in question have been subjected to a gift tax under the Revenue Act of 1932. *City Bank Farmers Trust Co.* v. *Hoey*, 101 F. 2d 9 (C. C. A. 2). I am unable to find in the words of section 302(c) adequate language to subject them to the estate tax. Concededly the incompetent herself could not "contemplate" death. The state court which directed the payments to be made did not purport to make transfers in contemplation of death and had no [fol. 446] legal power to do so. It cannot make testamentary dispositions for the incompetent, N. Y. Civ. Prac. Act §1383; and in making allowances to his family it "does not do this because, if the lunatic were to die tomorrow, they would be entitled to the entire distribution of his estate

* * *," but because "the court will not refuse to do, for the benefit of the lunatic, that which it is probable the lunatic himself would have done." Per Lord Eldon in *Ex parte Whitbread*, 2 Mer. 99, 102-3. Whether Congress would wish to impose an estate tax on gifts made out of an incompetent's surplus income by court order for the support and education of his family seems to me the merest surmise. At any rate, it has not said so in langauge justifying the courts in so holding. In my opinion the judgment should be reversed.

[fol. 447] UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, SECOND CIRCUIT

At a Stated Term of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in and for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Courthouse in the City of New York, on the 27th day of May one thousand nine hundred and forty-four.

Present: Hon. Learned Hand, Hon. Thomas W. Swan, Hon. Harrie B. Chase, Circuit Judges.

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST COMPANY, etc., HELEN HALL VAIL, Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

GEORGE T. McGOWAN, Collector, etc., Defendant-Appellee

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now hereby ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the judgment of said District Court be and it hereby is affirmed with costs.

It is further ordered that a Mandate issue to the said District Court in accordance with this decree.

Alexander M. Bell, Clerk.

[fol. 448] [Endorsed:] United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. City Bank Farmers Trust Com-

pany, etc., v. George T. McGowan, Collector, etc. Order for Mandate. United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. Filed May 27, 1944. Alexander M. Bell, Clerk.

[fol. 449] Clerk's Certificate to foregoing transcript omitted in printing.

[fol. 450] Supreme Court of the United States

Order Allowing Certiorari—Filed October 9, 1944

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.